

Coordinating Board for Higher Education

Public Policies

Revised July 2008



This page intentionally left blank.

CBHE Public Policies
Table of Contents

I. COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	6
A. Bylaws of the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education	6
B. Coordinated Plan	12
C. Relationship with Missouri's Independent Colleges and Universities	12
D. Model Higher Education Conflict of Interest Policy	14
E. Compliance with Missouri's Open Meetings and Records Management Statute	18
F. Guidelines for Recycling and Waste Management -- Missouri Public Higher Education Institutions	20
G. CBHE Policy on Dispute Resolution	23
H. Policy on Institutions that Willfully Disobey or Disregard Board Policy	26
II. STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	31
A. Institutional Mission Review	31
1. Mission Review Components	31
2. Institutions' Mission Statements	31
3. Quality Goals Related to Mission	35
a. Mission Differentiation by Admissions Guidelines	35
b. Satisfactory Academic Progress • Success Rates	36
c. Graduation and Time-to-Completion Rates	36
d. Remediation	36
e. Faculty Workload	37
f. Students Below Thirty-Third Percentile	37
g. Transfers	37
h. Highly Qualified Teachers	37
i. Minority Participation	38
j. Critical Skills and Disciplines	38
k. Mission Enhancement Accountability Measures	39
B. Institutional Nomenclature	39
C. Information and Data Collection and Reporting	40
1. Accountability Report	40
2. Performance of Missouri's Public High School Graduates Report	40
D. Off-Campus and Out-of-District Instruction	40
1. Clarification of the Operations and Funding of 1456 Sites Established by the General Assembly	40
2. Collaboration Among Proposed 1456 Sites and Existing Institutions	41
3. Lack of Compelling Need for Additional 1456 Sites	41
4. 1456 Sites in the Lake of the Ozarks Area	42
E. Community Colleges	42
1. Community College Subdistricting Plans	42
2. Community Colleges' Mission, Role, and Scope Statements	43
F. Postsecondary Technical Education	45
1. Vocational Education	45
2. Access to Vocational Technical Programs	45

3.	State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education.....	46
4.	State Planning and Coordination for Postsecondary Technical Education.....	47
5.	Approval of Fiscal Year Appropriation Requests and Distribution of Technical Funds Under the State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education	48
6.	Refined State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education	48
G.	Out-of-State Public Institutions that Offer Instruction in Missouri	50
III.	ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	53
A.	College Admissions	53
1.	High School Student Preparation: CBHE-Recommended High School Core Curriculum Guidelines.....	53
a.	Old Guidelines	53
b.	New Guidelines.....	56
2.	Advanced Credit Opportunities	58
a.	Advanced Placement.....	58
b.	Dual-Credit Policy	59
c.	Principles of Good Practice for Dual Credit Courses	65
3.	Selectivity and Missions for Public Institutions	69
4.	Remediation	71
5.	Highly Qualified Teacher	71
B.	Certificate/Degree Programs	71
1.	Statewide Academic Program Inventory	71
2.	Academic Programs Review Policies	72
a.	New/Off-Site Program Review	72
b.	Existing Program Review	89
1.	State Level Review	89
2.	Campus-Based Reviews.....	91
3.	Criteria for Degree Programs.....	92
4.	Doctoral Programs	93
3.	External Course Delivery.....	93
a.	Procedures for the Delivery of Courses at External Sites.....	93
b.	Plus-Two Programs for Public-Private Institutions	96
c.	Public Policy Guidelines on Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery	96
C.	Transfer/Articulation Issues	107
1.	Credit Transfer Guidelines.....	107
2.	Principles of Good Practice	132
3.	Increasing Transfers to Four-Year Schools	136
4.	Site Survey Policy.....	136
D.	Consumer Information.....	137
IV.	BUDGET AND FINANCE	140
A.	General Recommendations for Funding.....	140
B.	Higher Education Funding Policies Task Force	141
C.	Commitment to Modern Equipment.....	141
D.	Controlling Administrative/Noninstructional Funding Growth Rates.....	141
E.	Student Fees.....	141

F.	Guidelines for Selecting Priorities for Capital Improvement projects	142
G.	Appropriation Levels for Off-Campus and Out-of-District Sites	144
H.	Implementation of the Higher Education Student Funding Act	145
V. INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS ...		153
A.	Telecommunications-Based Delivery System Policies	153
B.	State Plan for a Telecommunications-Based System.....	153
C.	Guiding Principles for a Telecommunications-Based Delivery System.....	155
D.	Role of the CBHE in Supporting a Telecommunications-Based Delivery System... ..	156
E.	Implementation of a Telecommunications-Based Delivery System	156
F.	Eligibility Criteria for Proprietary Schools to be Considered to Access MOREnet Services.....	159
G.	Common Library Platform -- MOBIUS	160
H.	Appointment of the CBHE Advisory Committee on Technology and Instruction	161
I.	Missouri Learner's Network.....	161
J.	Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning/Web-Based Courses.....	161
VI. CONTRACTING FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES.....		164
A.	Reciprocal Agreement: Missouri/Kansas Reciprocal Agreement for Architecture, Dentistry, and Optometry	164
B.	Midwestern Higher Education Commission: Midwest Student Exchange Program Participation Agreement.....	169
VII. STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE		174
A.	Access Missouri	174

I. COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

A. BYLAWS OF THE MISSOURI COORDINATING BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

**(Adopted by the board October 1987;
revised October 12, 2006, and December 6, 2007)**

Article I Enabling Authority

These bylaws govern the conduct of the business and affairs of the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education ("Board") pursuant to the responsibilities vested in it by the Missouri Constitution and Revised Statutes.

Article II Members

The membership of this Board and the terms of office of each member are prescribed in Section 173.005 of the Missouri Revised Statutes. Any member desiring to resign from the Board shall submit such resignation in writing to the Secretary of the Board, who shall provide it to the Executive Committee for action. The Executive Committee shall immediately notify the Director of Boards and Commissions in the Governor's Office of such member's resignation.

Article III Officers

Section 1. Officers. The officers of the Board shall be: Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary. They shall be elected by the Board from its own membership. These officers shall perform the duties prescribed by the Missouri Revised Statutes, these bylaws and as may be prescribed by the Board.

Section 2. Election - Tenure of Officers. At the regular meeting of the board immediately prior to October 30, a Nominating Committee of three members shall be appointed by the Chair. It shall be the duty of this Committee to nominate candidates for the offices to be filled by election at the regular meeting immediately prior to December 31. Before the election at the regular meeting in December, following the report of the Nominating Committee, additional nominations from the floor shall be permitted. Officers' terms shall begin at the close of the regular December meeting, and officers shall serve for a period of one year and until their successors are elected and qualified. No member shall hold more than one office at a time. No

member shall be eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms in the same office, unless a member makes a motion that another member be permitted to serve more than two consecutive terms in the same office and the motion is approved by at least a two-thirds vote. No member shall be permitted to serve more than four consecutive terms in the same office under any circumstances.

Section 3. Duties of Officers.

Chair. The Chair of the Board shall preside at all meetings of the Board and shall be the spokesperson for the Board and shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Missouri Revised Statutes and by the Board. The Chair shall appoint the members of any committee established pursuant to these bylaws and shall name the Chair of each such committee.

Vice Chair. In the event of the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall serve as Chair of the Board and perform all the duties of the Chair. The Vice Chair shall perform such other duties as prescribed by the Missouri Revised Statutes and by the Board.

Secretary. The Secretary of the Board shall take minutes of any executive session of the board and shall perform other duties as prescribed the Missouri Revised Statutes and by the Board.

Article IV Meetings

Section 1. Meetings of the Board may be held at any place or places within the State of Missouri. The Board shall hold no less than four (4) regular meetings during each calendar year. Special or additional meetings may be called by the Chair or upon call of at least five (5) members of the Board. The purpose of the meeting shall be stated in the call.

Section 2. Notice of Meeting. The notice of meeting and agenda shall be in accordance with the Missouri Revised Statutes.

Section 3. Absence at Meetings. If any member of the Board fails to attend any two consecutive regularly called meetings of the Board, or any three regularly called meetings in any calendar year, of which meetings the member shall have had due notice, unless such absences shall be caused by sickness or some accident preventing the member's presence (as defined in Article IV, Section 4.A) at the meetings, the Chair shall bring the matter to the attention of the Director of Boards and Commissions in the Governor's Office. For purposes of this Section, "regularly called meetings" shall include the February, April, June, October, and December Board meetings, as well as the Board's summer retreat.

Section 4. Conduct of Meetings. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Any act of the majority of the members present at any Board meeting at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Board. Board members may participate in a meeting by means of conference telephone or similar communication equipment whereby all persons participating in or attending the meeting can communicate with each other, and participation in a meeting in this manner shall constitute presence in person at the meeting for all purposes.

All meetings of the Board and any Committee thereof must comply with the Missouri Revised Statutes on meetings of governmental bodies and maintenance of records by such bodies.

At all Board and Committee meetings, a staff member shall act as Recording Secretary. In the absence of a staff member, the Board or Committee shall designate a member to serve as Recording Secretary. Full and complete minutes shall be kept of each meeting and shall be submitted to Board members for review prior to the succeeding meeting.

Voting on all matters coming before the Board shall be voice vote. In all cases where the vote of the members present is unanimous, it shall be sufficient to indicate unanimity in the minutes of the proceedings. In all cases where the vote of the members present is not unanimous, the "ayes" and "nays" shall be separately entered upon the minutes. In the absence of such expression of dissent or an expression of abstention, a member of the Board who is present at any meeting in which action is taken on any matter shall be presumed to have assented to such actions unless, before the adjournment of the meeting, the member shall affirmatively request that the member's vote of "nay" be separately entered upon the minutes, or the member be recorded as not having voted.

The Board may meet for appropriate purposes in executive session. Any vote taken in executive session shall be deemed and retained confidential, subject to the closed meeting provisions the Missouri Revised Statutes.

Article V Committees

Section 1. Executive Committee. An Executive Committee shall be established and composed of five Board members: Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary of the Board, as well as Chairs of both the Audit and the Student Loan/Financial Aid Committees. The Executive Committee shall have general supervision of the affairs of the Board between its business meetings, make recommendations to the Board, and perform such other duties as are specified in these bylaws or as directed by the Board. The Executive Committee shall

be subject to the orders of the Board, and none of its acts shall conflict with action taken by the Board.

The Board Chair shall serve as the Chair of the Executive Committee. Meetings of the Executive Committee may be called by the Chair of the Executive Committee or upon call of at least three members of the Committee. The Commissioner of Higher Education may also request that the Chair call a meeting of the Executive Committee. The purpose of the meeting shall be stated in the call.

Section 2. Audit Committee. An Audit Committee composed of three Board members shall be established. The Chair of the Board shall appoint the members of the Audit Committee and at the same time shall name the Chair of the Committee promptly after the regular meeting immediately prior to December 31 of each year. Committee members shall serve for a period of one year and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

The Audit Committee shall receive and review all audit reports pertaining to the Board and the Department of Higher Education and such other audit reports as may be referred to the Committee. The Committee shall report to the Board on the contents of the reports and shall follow up with the Commissioner and department staff regarding resolution of any findings in the reports. The Committee shall report to the Board on the status of any such findings. The Committee shall perform such other duties as are specified in these bylaws or as directed by the Board.

Section 3. Student Loan/Financial Aid Committee. A Student Loan/Financial Aid Committee composed of three Board members shall be established. The Chair of the Board shall appoint the members of the Student Loan/Financial Aid Committee and at the same time shall name the Chair of the Committee promptly after the regular meeting immediately prior to December 31 of each year. Committee members shall serve for a period of one year and until their successors are appointed and qualified.

The Committee shall work with the Commissioner of Higher Education and Department staff on student loan/financial aid issues as they arise and shall, as necessary, make reports to the Board on such activities. The Committee shall perform such other duties as are specified in these bylaws or as directed by the Board.

Section 4. Other Committees. Such other committees, standing or special, shall be appointed by the Chair as the Board or the Executive Committee shall from time to time deem necessary to carry on the work of the Board. The Chair shall appoint the membership of such committees, which may, but need not, include members of the Board, and shall designate the matters to be considered by said committees. The Chair shall be an ex officio member of all committees except the Nominating Committee.

Article VI Advisory Committees

Section 1. Presidential Advisory Committee. Four times each year the Board shall meet with the Presidential Advisory Committee as established by the Missouri Revised Statutes. Such meetings shall enable the Presidential Advisory Committee to advise the Board of the views of the institutions on matters within the purview of the Board.

Section 2. Proprietary School Advisory Committee. The Board delegates responsibility to the Commissioner of Higher Education to meet with and receive reports from the Proprietary School Advisory Committee as established by the Missouri Revised Statutes.

Article VII Conduct of Business and Affairs

Section 1. Staff. The Board shall employ a Commissioner of Higher Education ("Commissioner") to serve at the pleasure of the Board. The Commissioner shall employ and determine the compensation of all such professional, clerical, and research personnel, including, where justified, specialists and/or consultants, as may be necessary to assist the Board in performing those duties outlined in the Missouri Revised Statutes. Except as otherwise expressly provided, all department staff shall be subject to the supervision and direction of the Commissioner.

The Commissioner shall have such duties and responsibilities as prescribed by the Board, including:

- Assume general direction of the staff to help meet the objectives set forth by the Board.
- Serve as liaison with the presidents, chancellors, and chief executive officers of institutions in carrying out policy objectives promulgated by the Board.
- Follow and keep the Board advised of all federal and state legislation affecting the Board and its purposes and objectives.
- Issue reports of Board action.
- Prepare, review, analyze, and implement all budgets which are approved by the Board.
- Make recommendations to the Board concerning the purposes, objectives, and responsibilities of the Board.

- Assist the Chair in the release of all information concerning the Board.
- Perform such other duties as prescribed by the Board and/or bylaw.

Section 2. Commissioner Search. The Board shall act as a committee of the whole as a search committee, unless the Chair, as directed by the Board, establishes a special committee for the purpose of searching for and screening candidates. The Board may include outside consultants and other persons in the search and screening process provided, however, that only Board members shall vote on the selection of a Commissioner.

Section 3. Evaluation of Commissioner. The Board shall annually evaluate the performance of the Commissioner. The purpose of the evaluation shall be to establish a record of performance over a period of time, to identify strengths, and to determine areas where more attention may be needed.

Article VIII Records

Full and complete records of Board actions and activities shall be kept available in accordance with Missouri Revised Statutes on governmental bodies and records.

Article IX Diversity

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education and its staff should use selection processes and criteria designed to ensure diverse representations when making appointments to various committees, councils, or commissions. In as much as reasonably possible, criteria for representation should include the following:

Individuals who have demonstrated appropriate expertise and experience through their vocation, employment, affiliation or interests in connection with the membership being assembled;

Individuals who reflect the various geographic regions of the state as a whole or other appropriate sub-unit directly in connection to the membership being assembled; and

Individuals who reflect the race, ethnicity, age, gender, and disability characteristics of the population of the state as a whole, or other appropriate sub-unit in connection with the membership being assembled.

In as much as reasonably possible, the campus presidents and chancellors, and their respective local boards should use a similar

selection process and criteria in making appointments to various committees, councils, or commissions. (Adopted June 7, 2001)

Article X
Parliamentary Authority

The rules contained in the current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* shall govern the Board in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws and any special rules of order the Board may adopt.

Article XI
Amendment of Bylaws

These bylaws may be amended at any regular meeting of the Board by a two-thirds vote, provided that the amendment has been submitted in writing at the previous regular meeting.

B. COORDINATED PLAN

(Adopted by the board July 30, 2008)

On July 30, 2008, the board adopted the Coordinated Plan (<http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/CoordinatedPlan.pdf>) as a foundation for further work in establishing a fully developed coordinated plan.

The board reaffirmed its directive to the Commissioner of Higher Education to continue working with the CBHE Strategic Planning Committee and with the presidents and chancellors of Missouri's colleges and universities in the development of draft operational measures, baseline data, target goals, timelines, and assigned responsibilities to be reported to the board at its April 2008 meeting for review and action.

NOTE: The Coordinated Plan is supported by a background document.

C. RELATIONSHIP WITH MISSOURI'S INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

NOTE: While this policy may be revised in the near future, it sets forth important policies about the CBHE's relationship with independent colleges and universities.

Background

In June, 1981 the chairman of the Coordinating Board appointed the Committee on Coordinating Board for Higher Education and Independent Institutions Relationships in response to issues raised by

an independent institution concerning the Coordinating Board's exercise of its program review authority. In the course of its considerations the committee decided to broaden the scope of its inquiry to include additional aspects of the board's association with the independent institutions and not to limit itself just to the program review function. The committee secured an informal Attorney General's opinion regarding the program review authority, conducted an open forum for institutional representatives, and thoroughly discussed the issues among themselves and Department of Higher Education staff. The committee's conclusions and recommendations concerning the appropriate relationship of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education with the independent institutions of Missouri are contained in the report, Committee on Coordinating Board for Higher Education and Independent Institutions Relationships.

Final Report (Adopted by the board December 10, 1982)

The final report of the Committee on the Coordinating Board for Higher Education and Independent Institution Relationships contained the following recommendations:

- The Coordinating Board for Higher Education should affirm the appropriateness of the current Program Review Policies and Procedures statement and its applicability to those independent institutions under the Board's jurisdiction. Further, the Coordinating Board should affirm its intention under the existing statutes to limit the outcomes of its program reviews for independent institutions to unbinding pertinent comments and recommendations and neither to approve/disapprove nor to endorse specific proposals.
- The Coordinating Board for Higher Education should endorse the program review decision criteria statement developed by the Committee on Coordinating Board for Higher Education and Independent Institution Relationships. This endorsement should reflect the board's intention to clarify the process by which it evaluates new program proposals, but it should not affect the status of the existing Program Review Policies and Procedures statement.
- The Coordinating Board for Higher Education should recognize the independent institutions' concerns regarding the confidentiality of certain institutional data and should agree to work with the institutions and appropriate governmental officials in an attempt to develop a solution to this problem which would encourage a closer relationship between the institutions, the Coordinating Board, and the professional staff of the Department of Higher Education.

- The Coordinating Board for Higher Education should express its concern regarding the lack of full compliance by all independent institutions with its data gathering program including the submission of new degree program proposals, and it should remind those institutions that they have a clear statutory obligation to answer the board's data requests or risk removal from the approved institution list for the Missouri Student Grant Program.
- The Coordinating Board for Higher Education should establish a Standing Committee on Academic Affairs which shall serve as the board's primary instrument to address academic policy issues which affect public sector institutions or independent section institutions and which relate to the board's statewide planning and coordination responsibilities.

D. MODEL HIGHER EDUCATION CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

Background

Section 173.735, RSMo, provides that all public institutions of higher education, including community colleges, shall adopt, by January 1, 1992, a conflict of interest policy for all faculty and staff of such institution. Any such institution not adopting such a policy shall be governed by a model higher education conflict of interest policy which shall be promulgated and approved by the coordinating board for higher education. All public institutions of higher education shall be governed by the requirements of this section as well as the provisions of sections 105.450 to 105.498, RSMo.

Model Conflict of Interest Policy

(Adopted by the board December 13, 1991)

a. Statement of Policy

The avoidance of any real or apparent conflicts of interest which could compromise the impartial, objective, and effective performance of the duties of employees of the institution is essential to the maintenance of the public trust in and to the responsible operation of the institution. Institutional personnel are expected not only to adhere to all laws regarding conflict of interest, but also to be alert to and avoid situations which have the appearance of a conflict of interest. In accordance with this expectation, all institutional personnel must avoid improper outside influences on their institutionally related decisions and activities.

b. Statutory Requirements

All employees shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapter 105 RSMo, dealing with conflicts of interest, as well as any other state law governing official conduct. Failure to comply with those requirements shall be considered a violation of this policy. Terms used in this policy have a meaning consistent with their use in Chapter 105 RSMo, a copy of which must be attached to this policy.

c. Conflict of Interest

Institutional personnel shall not act or refrain from acting in any lawfully empowered capacity within the institution in return for, or in return for the offer of, anything of monetary value to the employee or any third person made or received in relationship to or as a condition of the performance of an official act, other than institutionally paid compensation for performance of official duties.

Institutional personnel shall not disclose or otherwise use confidential information obtained in the course of their official capacity at the institution in any manner with the intent of securing or actually resulting in financial gain for the employee, any other person, or any business.

Institutional employees shall not transact business or approve or participate in the approval of the transaction of business on behalf of the institution with any person or business entity with which the institutional employee has a substantial interest or family interest or relationship within the third degree of consanguinity of affinity, except for transactions made pursuant to an award on a contract let or sale made after public notice and competitive bidding, provided that the bid or offer is the lowest received.

Consultation is the application of professional and scholarly expertise in the external community, regardless of whether the activity is income-producing or not. Consultation is considered a business activity subject to the provisions of this policy when the entity for which the employee consults transacts business with the institution or is in competition with the institution, or where the consultation itself competes with the work of the institution.

Institutional employees shall not transact business, including performing services for the sale, lease or rental of property, with the institution for receipt or payment of any compensation, other than the compensation provided by the institution for the performance of official duties, except for transactions made pursuant to an award on a contract let or sale made after public notice and competitive bidding, provided that the bid or offer is the lowest received.

Institutional employees shall not act on any matter in their capacity as employees of the institution with the intent to provide a special

monetary benefit to themselves or their family or with the intent of influencing, either positively or negatively, the employees' noninstitutional employment or business activity of interest.

d. Personal Gain

Institutional personnel shall not realize any personal gain, in any form, from any purchase of goods or services by the institution, from actions taken by a representative or employee of the institution, nor shall institutional personnel accept any gift, gratuity or reward with a monetary value in excess of \$25, from any person or other entity which transacts business with the institution or which seeks to transact such business. This requirement shall not infringe on property rights relating to the development of education or other materials which have been granted to employees by the institution.

Institutional employees may not receive any direct financial benefit from the sale of textbooks or other class materials to students at the institution. Royalties and other such compensation resulting from the authorship of or contribution to the development of educational materials are not considered direct financial benefit under this policy.

Institutional employees shall not use their position with or the property of the institution for personal or political gain.

e. Disclosure Requirements

When it is proposed that the institution engage in a business transaction, including any type of grantor contract, with a private firm or corporation in which an institutional employee has a substantial interest, that employee shall make a full disclosure of that interest, in writing, to the official having the approval authority for that transaction and to the person responsible for the institutional conflict of interest reporting process. If there is a change in the financial interest of an employee during the term of the transaction which brings any such interest within the definition of a substantial interest, the change shall be reported immediately, in writing, to both the responsible approval and conflict of interest authorities.

Institutional employees participating in the selection of a prospective employee, a consultant, or a contractor to provide goods or services to the institution shall disclose to the official having the approval authority and the conflict of interest authority, in writing, any close personal friendship, business association, or family relationship that the employee may have with the prospective employee, consultant, contractor, or their businesses.

These reporting requirements are in addition to, and do not relieve an employee from, the responsibility for making disclosures required by Chapter 105 of the Missouri statutes pertaining to conflict of interest.

f. Nepotism

Institutional personnel shall not participate in the selection and/or hiring of an employee of the institution who is related to the employee within the fourth degree of consanguinity of affinity.

Institutional employees shall not supervise, either directly or indirectly, the work of another employee who is related within such fourth degree unless that supervisory role is specifically approved by the personnel officer for the institution.

g. Sanctions

The institution shall establish and inform all employees of the existence and operation of an internal process for receiving employee reports required by this policy and to receive complaints or requests for investigations of violations or suspected violations of this policy or the provisions of the state's conflict of interest law.

Employees in violation of this policy are subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment. In addition, any employee knowingly violating the conflict of interest law also shall be subject to punishment as prescribed by section 105.478, RSMo.

Pursuant to section 105.467 RSMo, the institution is prohibited from discharging, threatening, or otherwise discriminating against a person, or an employee acting on behalf of a person, because that person or employee reports or is about to report a violation or suspected violation of this policy or of law or is requested by the Missouri Ethics Commission to participate in an investigation, hearing, or inquiry held by the commission or any related court action. These protections shall not apply to anyone who knowingly or recklessly makes a false report.

h. Appeals

An employee who is subject to disciplinary action based on an allegation of violation of this policy shall be entitled to full due process rights provided under the appropriate grievance process for that employee classification.

Complaints alleging violations of the state's conflict of interest law (Chapter 105) or this policy may be received and investigated by the Missouri Ethics Commission.

E. COMPLIANCE WITH MISSOURI'S OPEN MEETINGS AND RECORDS MANAGEMENT STATUTE

(Adopted by the board October 23, 1987)

The board has adopted the following open meeting and records management policy statement:

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education holds the management of records and the release of information therefrom to be administrative functions and those responsibilities are charged to the Commissioner of Higher Education who shall administer the management of access to departmental records, including the appointment of custodians of records, in compliance with the provisions of Sections 610.010 through 610.030, RSMo and with actions of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education taken thereunder.

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education (the "board") hereby declares all of the records of the board and of the Department of Higher Education (the "department") which relate to the following categories to be closed records within the meaning of Sections 610.010 to 610.028, RSMo, Senate Bill 2, Eighty-Fourth General Assembly, First Regular Session, for the reason that such records are authorized to be closed under Section 610.021, RSMo:

(1) (Section 610.021 (1-15) RSMo) Legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public government body or its representatives and its attorneys. However, any minutes of vote relating to litigation involving a public governmental body shall be made public upon final disposition of the matter voted upon; provided, however, in matters involving the exercise of the power of eminent domain, the vote shall be announced or become public immediately following the action on the motion to authorize institution of such a legal action. Legal work product shall be considered a closed record;

(2) Leasing, purchase or sale of real estate by a public governmental body where public knowledge of the transaction might adversely affect the legal consideration therefor. However, any minutes or vote of public record approving a contract relating to the leasing, purchase or sale of real estate by a public governmental body shall be made public upon execution of the lease, purchase or sale of the real estate;

(3) Hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public government body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded. However, any vote on a final decision, when taken by a public governmental body, to hire, fire,

promote or discipline an employee of a public governmental body must be made available to the public within seventy-two hours of the close of the meeting where such action occurs; provided, however, that any employee so affected shall be entitled to prompt notice of such decision during the seventy-two hour period before such decision is made available to the public. As used in this subdivision, the term "personal information" means information relating to the performance or merit of individual employees;

(4) The state militia or National Guard or any part thereof;

(5) Nonjudicial mental or physical health proceedings involving identifiable persons, including medical, psychiatric, psychological, or alcoholism or drug dependency diagnosis or treatment;

(6) Scholastic probation, expulsion, or graduation of identifiable individuals, including records of individual test or examination scores; however, personally identifiable student records maintained by public educational institutions shall be open for inspection by the parents, guardian or other custodian of students under the age of eighteen years and by the parents, guardian or other custodian and the student if the student is over the age of eighteen years;

(7) Testing and examination materials, before the test or examination is given or, if it is to be given again, before so given again;

(8) Welfare cases of identifiable individuals;

(9) Preparation, including any discussions or work product, on behalf of a public governmental body or its representatives for negotiations with employee groups;

(10) Software codes for electronic data processing and documentation thereof;

(11) Specifications for competitive bidding, until either the specifications are officially approved by the public governmental body or the specifications are published for bid;

(12) Sealed bids and related documents until the earlier of either when the bids are opened, or all bids are accepted or all bids are rejected;

(13) Individually identifiable personnel records, performance ratings or records pertaining to employees or applicants for employment, except that this exemption shall not apply to the names, positions, salaries and lengths of service of officers and employees of public agencies once they are employed as such;

(14) Records which are protected from disclosure by law;

(15) Meetings and public records relating to scientific and technological innovations in which the owner has a proprietary interest.

F. GUIDELINES FOR RECYCLING AND WASTE MANAGEMENT -- MISSOURI PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

(Adopted by the board June 29, 1990)

Pursuant to 34.032.6, RSMo, the Coordinating Board for Higher Education is directed to develop and distribute, in cooperation with the Office of Administration and the state's public colleges and universities, guidelines for waste reduction and the collection of recyclable materials generated in classrooms, administrative offices, dormitories, cafeterias and similar campus locations. The purpose of these guidelines is to coordinate the efforts of the colleges and universities for the implementation of a waste reduction and recycling program. These guidelines contain a broad spectrum of program elements, which can be implemented subject to the development of specific implementation strategies at each institution. A broad array of options was developed to maximize the practicality of establishing recycling programs in as many institutional settings as possible.

Policy Statement

It shall be the policy of the Coordinating Board for Higher that the public colleges and universities of Missouri should implement recycling and waste reduction programs to the maximum extent practicable considering the amount of recyclables generated in each facility, the local market for recyclable materials, and facilities considerations including storage space and fire and safety regulations. The Coordinating Board for Higher Education strongly encourages to the extent that it is practical the procurement by the institutions of goods that are made from recovered materials when such materials can be reasonably substituted for products from virgin materials.

Guidelines for Implementation

Each institution should develop a specific recycling and waste reduction implementation plan which reflects the unique conditions on its campus. These recycling guidelines contain eight elements which are designed to ensure effective plan implementation. Due to the variety of conditions at the colleges and universities, these program elements may be modified to fit the conditions at a specified institution as necessary.

Program Coordinator

Each institution shall designate one person in an existing position to serve as a Solid Waste Management Coordinator to ensure that the institution effectively meets the requirements of Missouri statutes and these guidelines. Each coordinator may designate program monitors to ensure coordination and implementation of the program and to facilitate the training of employees as to procedures of the recycling program.

Identification of Recyclable Materials

At the direction of its Solid Waste Management Coordinator, each institution shall conduct a waste audit of its operation. The preferred method is to conduct a separate audit of each facility of the institution, however specific campus conditions and limitation may require other approaches. As a part of the waste audit, the coordinator shall determine what recyclables are in the waste stream of the institution. This audit should result in the consideration of available alternatives and the selection of the most effective method for reducing identified waste streams including, but not limited to, waste recycling.

Each institution should adopt a plan for material recycling based on the findings of the required waste audit. Items considered should include, but are not limited to, paper, corrugated boxes, plastics, aluminum, waste oil, automotive batteries, and solvents. The institution shall report both the results of the solid waste audit and the institutional plan for implementing a program of waste reduction and recycling to the Coordinating Board for January 1, 1991. Subsequent annual reports to the Coordinating Board shall be prepared by each institution, which provide information on implementation progress.

Separation of Materials

The preferred method of separation of recyclable waste will be source separation by the employee or student. However, other methods of separation should be adopted as necessitated by campus conditions. Special containers should be provided at convenient locations for collection and removal of the recycle materials to the central collection area for the facility.

Concentration of Materials

Owing to the variety of conditions, it will be necessary to have a flexible implementation plan for the concentration of paper and other recyclables. Under all concentration scenarios, central bins should be provided in high generation areas. (For example, in the case of paper waste, at walk-up copy machines and duplicating centers, copy rooms and central file areas.) Alternatives for concentration of

materials should include, but are not limited to, bringing the materials to central bin locations by employees or program monitors and janitorial pick up and transportation to central bins.

Removal to Storage Area

The removal to the storage area for transportation of recyclables from the institution will be determined in the individual implementation plan for each institution or campus. Acceptable methods include, but are not limited to, removal by employees of the institution, by contracted janitorial services or institutional custodial crews, or by any other organization which has been contracted for the purpose of such removal.

Storage and Pick Up

A secure storage area should be designated for the concentration of separated recyclables for pickup from the institution. Storage conditions shall meet all applicable local, state, or federal requirements for fire and safety codes. The Solid Waste Management Coordinator for each institution should determine the needs for special bins, compactors, or baling equipment at each storage area. The institution should set up appropriate contracts with recyclers and other potential purchasers of recyclable wastes, in cooperation with state agency efforts when possible, for the reutilization of such materials. In the case of those institutions that are under the jurisdiction of Chapter 34 RSMo, purchasing statutes, state contracts for the collection of recyclables shall be utilized.

Confidential Materials

The Solid Waste Management Coordinator for each institution should review the needs for the use of special disposal procedures for confidential materials. As possible, the institution should develop special procedures for the appropriate destruction of confidential materials in a manner such that those materials may be recycled.

Implementation and Promotion

Each institution should implement a recycling and waste reduction program by January 1, 1991. Application of the program to a specific site or facility should begin as soon as possible after January 1 based on local conditions and limitations.

The Solid Waste Management Coordinator should notify institutional employees who will be participating in the recycling program of the program elements and objectives so that maximum participation may be obtained. The Office of Administration should make available to the institutions such educational materials as are either developed or utilized by the recycling task force of the Executive Branch Department.

Environmentally Conscious Procurement

All institutions of higher education under the jurisdiction of Chapter 34 RSMo, purchasing statutes, must implement the preference provisions of section 34.031 RSMo. Institutions should strive to maximize the purchase of products made from recovered materials and to give full consideration to the purchase of products that are recyclable. A recyclable product is any product that can be separated at the point of discard or from the solid waste stream for utilization as a raw material in the manufacture of a new product and for which there is an existing identified accessible market and an existing local collection system in place.

G. CBHE POLICY ON DISPUTE RESOLUTION

(Adopted by the board December 6, 2007)

General Description and Intent

Senate Bill 389, which became law August 28, 2007, gives the Commissioner of Higher Education authority to mediate disputes that arise between institutions concerning the use of state resources and jurisdictional boundaries. This policy sets forth the process by which such dispute resolution will be conducted.

Definitions and Acronyms

1. CBHE: The Coordinating Board for Higher Education.
2. Commissioner: The Commissioner of Higher Education or his/her designee.
3. Dispute: A disagreement between two or more institutions that involves jurisdictional boundaries or the use or expenditure of any state resources whatsoever.
4. Institution: An approved public institution of higher education, as defined in § 173.1102, RSMo, provided it is also either accredited or a candidate for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and provided it offers a postsecondary course of instruction at least two years in length leading to conferral of a degree.
5. MDHE: The Missouri Department of Higher Education.
6. Parties: The institutions involved in a dispute.

Process

1. By accepting a state appropriation a public institution of higher education agrees that during the fiscal year in which it receives the

funds it will submit to binding dispute resolution with regard to disputes.

2. Dispute resolution may be appropriate in circumstances including but not limited to situations within the purview of the CBHE where tensions in an area reach a critical mass, resulting in potentially detrimental effects on the delivery of academic programs; where there is evidence of excessive duplication of services when multiple off-campus/out-of-district higher education sites exist within the same community; or where institutions engage in excessive competition with each other, resulting in less than efficient use of state funds. The dispute resolution process will be initiated only after all reasonable informal attempts to resolve the dispute have failed. An institution that participates in this process shall not be deemed to have waived any legal challenges it might have to the authority or jurisdiction of the CBHE or the Commissioner of Higher Education over the subject matter in dispute.
3. The dispute resolution process may be initiated by an institution, the Commissioner, or the CBHE. If any such person or entity believes that a dispute exists, they may make a written request of the Commissioner to be put on the agenda of the CBHE's next regularly scheduled meeting. The Commissioner will notify all potential parties to the dispute of the time, date, and place of the CHBE meeting. At the meeting, the person or entity seeking to initiate the dispute resolution process will have an opportunity to describe the dispute and the reasons they believe dispute resolution is warranted. The affected institution(s) will have an opportunity during the meeting to respond and to describe all efforts they have made to resolve the dispute. The Commissioner or CBHE may set time limits on oral presentations at the CBHE meeting if he/she feels it is fair and necessary to do so. The CBHE shall, by majority vote, determine whether to refer the dispute to the Commissioner for dispute resolution.
4. If the CBHE votes to refer a dispute to the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall determine whether he/she will preside over the dispute resolution process, or if he/she will designate another individual to do so. He/she may appoint a designee if (a) he/she believes there is a real or perceived conflict of interest that may undermine the process or (b) he/she believes that the complexity, timing, or other aspect of the dispute creates a situation in which the Commissioner will have difficulty presiding over the process. The Commissioner may designate an MDHE staff member to serve as his/her designee. The institutions that are parties to the dispute may also elect to hire an external consultant to preside over the dispute resolution process, provided that such consultant is acceptable to all parties and to the Commissioner. If the parties elect to designate an external consultant, the costs associated with the dispute resolution process shall be shared equally by the institutions that are parties to the dispute. The designee shall have the same authority as the

Commissioner in the dispute resolution process. The Commissioner shall identify the person who will preside over the dispute resolution process as soon as possible.

5. Within one week after the CBHE votes to refer a dispute to the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall notify all parties of the commencement of the dispute resolution process. Such notice shall describe the nature of the dispute(s) to be addressed and require the parties to set forth their positions in writing within thirty days after the day the notice is sent. The Commissioner may request additional information at this or any other time in the dispute resolution process.
6. After the Commissioner has received all of the preliminary information he/she deems necessary, the Commissioner shall schedule a meeting at a time and place agreeable to all parties. The Commissioner shall inform the parties of the format for the meeting, including any time limits on oral presentations he/she deems fair and necessary.
7. At the meeting, each party shall have an opportunity to be heard and to ask questions of the other party or parties. The meeting shall be recorded, and the recording shall constitute the record. The Commissioner shall work with the parties to identify solutions that are mutually acceptable to all involved.
8. The Commissioner shall base his or her decision on the written and verbal representations made by the parties during the dispute resolution process and may consider other factors, including but not limited to the reasonableness of each party's response to solutions proposed during the meeting.
9. The Commissioner shall issue a written decision within thirty days after the meeting. The decision shall set forth the Commissioner's conclusions, the factual basis upon which the conclusions are based, and any actions required of the parties.
10. An institution aggrieved by the Commissioner's decision may make a written appeal to the CBHE to reconsider the Commissioner's decision within thirty days after the day the Commissioner gives the parties notice of his/her decision. The appeal shall set forth the reason(s) the institution is aggrieved and the reason(s) the institution believes the Commissioner decided wrongly. The CBHE shall provide all parties with copies of the written appeal.
11. The other parties to the dispute and the Commissioner may respond in writing to the aggrieved party's appeal within thirty days after the date the CBHE provides copies of the appeal.
12. The CBHE shall consider the record of the proceedings leading up to the appeal at its next regularly scheduled meeting. At such meeting,

the CBHE may inquire of any party to the dispute and of the Commissioner and make a determination based on the record.

13. After the CBHE has received all information it deems necessary, the CBHE shall make a final and binding decision including a finding of fact and conclusions about the appeal by means of a majority vote of all currently appointed CBHE members, whether such members are present at the meeting by electronic means or in person; provided, however, that no vote will be made on the appeal unless a quorum is established. The CBHE may accept, reject, or modify all or part of the Commissioner's decision and may ask the Commissioner to resume dispute resolution to address any or all issue(s).

General Requirements

1. Neither the dispute resolution process nor the appeal is a legal proceeding. Parties to a dispute may, however, be represented by attorneys during any and all stages of the dispute resolution process or the appeal. The Commissioner may ask questions directly of an institutional representative at any time; the institutional representative shall respond to such questions.
2. All parties participating in the dispute resolution process or an appeal must provide all information requested in a timely manner.
3. All parties will receive copies of all documents provided to or by the Commissioner or the CBHE in connection with the dispute resolution process or an appeal.
4. All written documentation submitted as part of the dispute resolution process or an appeal shall be considered public information and will be made available to any person or entity that requests it. "Written documentation" includes but is not necessarily limited to all correspondence, tables, charts, and data files.

H. POLICY ON INSTITUTIONS THAT WILLFULLY DISOBEY OR DISREGARD BOARD POLICY

Approved by the Board February 7, 2008

I. Statutory Language

§ 173.005.2(10), RSMo, provides:

If any institution of higher education in this state, public or private, willfully fails or refuses to follow any lawful guideline, policy or procedure established or prescribed by the coordinating board, or knowingly deviates from any such guideline, or knowingly acts without coordinating board approval where such approval is required, or willfully fails to comply with

any other lawful order of the coordinating board, the coordinating board may, after a public hearing, withhold or direct to be withheld from that institution any funds the disbursement of which is subject to the control of the coordinating board, or may remove the approval of the institution as an "approved institution" within the meaning of section 173.1102.

If any such public institution willfully disregards board policy, the commissioner of higher education may order such institution to remit a fine in an amount not to exceed one percent of the institution's current fiscal year state operating appropriation to the board. The board shall hold such funds until such time that the institution, as determined by the commissioner of higher education, corrects the violation, at which time the board shall refund such amount to the institution. If the commissioner determines that the institution has not redressed the violation within one year, the fine amount shall be deposited into the general revenue fund, unless the institution appeals such decision to the full coordinating board, which shall have the authority to make a binding and final decision, by means of a majority vote, regarding the matter. However, nothing in this section shall prevent any institution of higher education in this state from presenting additional budget requests or from explaining or further clarifying its budget requests to the governor or the general assembly[.]

II. Policy

Definitions and Acronyms

- A. ***Affected institution***: The institution potentially subject to the withholding of funds, the removal of designation as an "approved institution," or a fine.
- B. ***Approved institution***: An institution designated as "approved" within the meaning of § 173.1102, RSMo.
- C. ***CBHE***: The Coordinating Board for Higher Education.
- D. ***CBHE policy***: Any regulation promulgated by the CBHE; any policy adopted by the CBHE, the adoption of which shall be evidenced by inclusion in the *CBHE Public Policies Manual*; or an order of the CBHE issued in writing to the affected institution.
- E. ***Commissioner***: The Commissioner of Higher Education or his/her designee.
- F. ***Institution***: Any public or private institution of higher education located in Missouri.
- G. ***MDHE***: The Missouri Department of Higher Education.

Process. The CBHE may withhold state appropriations that are subject to the direct control of the CBHE, remove an institution's designation as an "approved institution," or fine an institution that willfully disregards CBHE policy. The process for imposing those penalties is set forth below.

A. Withholding state appropriations or removing an institution's designation as an "approved institution"

1. Any institution that willfully fails or refuses to follow any CBHE policy or knowingly acts without CBHE approval where such approval is required by law or policy may be subject to one of the following penalties:
 - a. The CBHE may withhold or direct to be withheld from that institution any funds, or any portion of the funds, the disbursement of which is subject to the direct control of the CBHE. Such withholding shall be in effect until such time as the institution, as determined by the Commissioner or by the CBHE on appeal, corrects the violation.
 - b. The CBHE may remove that institution's designation as an "approved institution" within the meaning of § 173.1102, RSMo. The removal of such designation shall be in effect until such time that the institution, as determined by the Commissioner or by the CBHE on appeal, corrects the violation.
2. The penalties described above may only be imposed after a public hearing, the requirements of which are described below:
 - a. The affected institution must receive notice of the public hearing. Such notice shall be issued at least 30 calendar days before the date of the public hearing and shall be delivered by electronic mail to the president or chancellor of the affected institution. The notice shall advise the affected institution of the time, date, and place of the public hearing; the conduct allegedly giving the CBHE cause to impose penalty; and a statement that the affected institution shall have an opportunity to be heard at the public hearing.
 - b. The public hearing shall be an open meeting of the CBHE.
 - c. The public hearing may take place at a regularly scheduled CBHE meeting or at another time determined by MDHE staff. If the public hearing takes place at a time other than during a regularly scheduled CBHE meeting, MDHE staff shall consult with representatives of the affected institution in setting the time, date, and place of the public hearing.
 - d. During the public hearing, the CBHE shall give the affected institution an opportunity to be heard; provided, however, that the CBHE may set reasonable time limits on the affected institution's presentation if it is necessary to do so.
 - e. The CBHE shall render a decision within a reasonable period of time after the public hearing.
 - f. The affected institution shall receive a written decision from the CBHE. The decision shall set forth the CBHE's conclusions, the factual grounds upon which the conclusions are based, the penalty imposed, and the actions the institution must take to correct the violation and cause the penalty to be removed.

3. If the affected institution believes that the violation *has been* corrected and the Commissioner determines that the violation *has not been* corrected, the affected institution may appeal the Commissioner's determination to the CBHE. The appeal before the CBHE shall be conducted pursuant to the requirements for a public hearing, set forth in section A.2. above. If the CBHE determines that the institution has corrected the violation, the CBHE shall direct the MDHE to restore the institution's designation as an "approved institution" or to release any funds withheld to the institution.

B. Fining institutions

1. The Commissioner may fine an institution that willfully disregards any CBHE policy up to 1% of the institution's current year state operating appropriation. The payment of such fine shall be ordered in writing or by electronic mail. The order shall also contain a description of the institution's actions that evidence and establish a willful disregard of CBHE policy and the actions the institution must take to correct the violation.
2. The institution may appeal the Commissioner's order to the CBHE. The appeal shall be in writing and shall set forth the rationale for the appeal. It shall be submitted in writing or by electronic mail to the Commissioner, who shall convey the appeal to the CBHE, within two weeks of the date the Commissioner's order was sent. The institution shall, however, remit the fine as required by the order at or before the time it sends its appeal to the Commissioner.
3. The institution shall remit the fine to the CBHE, which shall hold the fine until such time as the Commissioner determines that the institution has corrected the violation or until the time the fine is deposited in the state's general revenue fund. If the Commissioner determines that the institution has corrected the violation, the CBHE shall return the entire fine to the institution.
4. If, after a period of one year after the date the Commissioner orders the institution to pay the fine, the Commissioner determines that the institution has not corrected the violation, the Commissioner shall provide the institution with notice in writing or by electronic mail that he/she will request that the CBHE deposit the fine into the state's general revenue fund no later than ten calendar days after the date of the notice.
5. The institution may appeal the Commissioner's determination that the violation has not been corrected, in which case the fine shall not be deposited into the state's general revenue fund until such time as the institution has had an opportunity to be heard by the CBHE.
6. The appeal hearing before the CBHE shall be conducted pursuant to the requirements for a public hearing, set forth in section A.2. above.
7. The CBHE may make a final and binding decision about the institution's appeal, provided that a majority of all CBHE members present during the public hearing vote and that a quorum is established, whether members participate in person or by electronic means.

8. If the institution appeals and the CBHE determines that the institution has corrected the violation, the CBHE shall cause the fine to be returned to the institution as soon as may reasonably be accomplished.
9. If the institution does not appeal or if the CBHE determines during or after the appeal hearing that the institution has not corrected the violation, the CBHE shall cause the fine to be deposited into the state's general revenue fund on the date specified by the Commissioner, or as soon thereafter as may reasonably be accomplished.
10. **Before an institution's actions are deemed "willful" or "knowing," the Commissioner must determine that the policy or requirement allegedly disregarded or otherwise not followed has been communicated in writing to the institution, is contained in the *CBHE's Public Policies Manual*, or is contained in Title 6 of the Code of State Regulations.**

II. STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

A. INSTITUTIONAL MISSION REVIEW

1. Mission Review Components

(Adopted by the board April 12, 2001)

The board reaffirmed the principle that all items identified in the board's April 1999 second cycle five-year mission review guidelines are required to complete the mission review process. The board also recommended that mission review must be completed before related funding recommendations are made.

Those components are:

1. A needs assessment of institutional actions and initiatives necessary to meet their agreed-upon mission as part of their strategic planning process.
2. An assessment of the degree to which original goals and results were accomplished;
3. An assessment of the institution's agreed-upon mission statement;
4. An evaluation and assessment of the institution's strategic plan;
5. An evaluation of the institution's statistical profile;
6. Financial analysis of the institution's fiscal condition and adequacy of its funding level; and
7. An assessment of the condition of the institution's physical plant.

2. Institutions' Mission Statements

NOTE: The following information about institutions' missions is the most current on file with the MDHE. Updated information will be requested when the MDHE resumes its mission review program.

1. Truman State University - Mission Revision (1985)

Highly selective, master's level-liberal arts and sciences university, focusing on the quality of the teaching and learning environment.

- Progress report on Mission Implementation Plan (*April 17, 1997*)
- Mission Implementation Plan Approved (*October 9, 1997*)
- Approved the FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities (*October 8, 1998*)
- Approved the FY 2001 Mission Enhancement Activities (*October 7, 1999*)

2. Harris-Stowe State College - Mission Revision *(December 10, 1992)*

Baccalaureate-level, moderately selective, admissions institution with selected applied professional programs, serving the city of St. Louis.

- Progress report on Mission Implementation Plan *(June 12, 1997)*
- Mission Implementation Plan Approved *(October 9, 1997)*
- Approved the FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities *(October 8, 1998)*
- Approved the FY 2001 Mission Enhancement Activities *(October 7, 1999)*

3. Southwest Missouri State University - Mission Revision *(January 13, 1995)*

Master's level, selective admissions institution with a statewide mission in public affairs, providing programmatic access for southwest Missouri, with a two-year branch campus in West Plains and a research station in Mountain Grove.

- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1998 *(October 10, 1996)*
- Progress report on Mission Implementation Plan *(April 17, 1997)*
- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1999 *(October 9, 1997)*
- Results of State Investments in First Cycle of Mission Review and Enhancements (April 2000)

4. Missouri Southern State College - Mission Revision *(January 13, 1995)*

Baccalaureate-level, moderately selective admissions institution with an international emphasis serving the greater Joplin area.

- Progress report on Mission Implementation Plan *(April 17, 1997)*
- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1999 *(October 9, 1997)*
- Results of State Investments in First Cycle of Mission Review and Enhancements (April 2000)

5. Missouri Western State College - Mission Revision *(January 13, 1995)*

Baccalaureate-level, open enrollment institution focusing on access to learner success, with a special retention program, Access Plus, serving the greater St. Joseph area.

- Progress report on Mission Implementation Plan *(June 12, 1997)*
- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1999 *(October 9, 1997)*
- Results of State Investments in First Cycle of Mission Review and Enhancements (April 2000)

6. Central Missouri State University - Mission Revision *(October 10, 1996)*

Master's level institution with moderately selective admissions and a statewide mission focusing on programmatic access to professional applied sciences and technologies.

- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1999 *(October 9, 1997)*

- Approved FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 8, 1998)
- Results of State Investments in First Cycle of Mission Review and Enhancements (April 12, 2001)

7. Northwest Missouri State University - Mission Revision
(October 10, 1996)

Master's level, moderately selective admissions institution serving northwest Missouri through the extended electronic campus.

- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1999 (October 9, 1997)
- Approved FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 8, 1998)
- Results of State Investments in First Cycle of Mission Review and Enhancements (April 12, 2001)

8. Southeast Missouri State University - Mission Revision (October 10, 1996)

Master's level, moderately selective admissions institution serving southeast Missouri through extended partnerships, with special emphasis on experiential learning.

- Approved Plan for Programmatic Initiatives Related to Mission Enhancement for FY 1999 (October 9, 1997)
- Approved FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 8, 1998)
- Results of State Investments in First Cycle of Mission Review and Enhancements (April 12, 2001)

9. Lincoln University – Mission Revision (October 9, 1997)

The core mission of Lincoln University is to provide excellent educational opportunities for a diverse student population in the context of an open enrollment institution. The university provides student-centered learning in a nurturing environment, integrating teaching, research, and service. Lincoln University offers relevant, high quality undergraduate and select graduate programs that prepare students for careers and lifelong learning. These programs are grounded in the liberal arts and sciences and focused on public service professions that meet the academic and professional needs of its historical and statewide student clientele.

- Approved FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 8, 1998)
- Approved FY 2001 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 7, 1999)

10. University of Missouri System – Mission Revision (October 9, 1997)

The mission of the University of Missouri, as a land-grant university and Missouri's only public research and doctoral-level institution, is to discover, disseminate, apply, and preserve knowledge. It thereby stimulates learning by its students, and lifelong learning by Missouri citizens, and advances the health and well being and the intellectual, cultural, social, and economic interests of the people of Missouri, the nation, and the world.

- Approved FY 2000 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 8, 1998)
- Approved FY 2001 Mission Enhancement Activities (October 7, 1999)

(a) University of Missouri Outreach and Extension Mission Revision
(October 9, 1997)

The mission of University Outreach and Extension, in partnership with the UM campuses, Lincoln University, the people of Missouri through county extension councils, and the Cooperative Research, Education, and Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is to serve Missouri by extending the research-based knowledge and problem-solving resources of the University of Missouri and Lincoln University to focus on high priority needs of people throughout the state.

(b) University of Missouri-Columbia – Mission Revision (*October 9, 1997*)

The comprehensive nature of the campus, coupled with a faculty committed to teaching and research, generates a unique synergy that involves undergraduate, graduate, and professional school students in a learning community and scholarly process, thus preparing them for success in a global environment. Focused activities include strengthening health and agricultural productivity through the life sciences; research on economic, educational, and social issues; and applying research and new technologies to the problems of the state.

(c) University of Missouri-Kansas City – Mission Revision (*October 9, 1997*)

UM-Kansas City is the only public university in western Missouri offering graduate and professional study at the highest academic level. UMKC's programming focuses on three areas: visual and performing arts, health sciences, and urban affairs (academic programs such as law, business and education important to urban communities) from model undergraduate education to graduate and professional study, including an innovative interdisciplinary Ph.D. program.

(d) University of Missouri-Rolla – Mission Revision (*October 9, 1997*)

The University of Missouri-Rolla has a major responsibility for meeting Missouri's needs for engineering education. UMR conducts research to advance knowledge, provide essential support for graduate education, and enhance undergraduate education. There is a special emphasis on research in materials, manufacturing, infrastructure, geotechnical, and environmental engineering science.

(e) University of Missouri-St. Louis – Mission Revision – (*October 9, 1997*)

UM-St. Louis educates traditional and nontraditional students in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs so that they may provide leadership in health professions; liberal and fine arts; science and technology; and metropolitan affairs such as business, education, and public policy. University outreach advances knowledge in all areas, and through outreach and public service, assists in solving, in particular, problems in the St. Louis region. Its special commitment to partnership provides UM-St. Louis with a leadership role among public educational and cultural institutions in improving the region's quality of life, while its relations with two- and four-year colleges and universities in the St. Louis region promote seamless educational opportunities.

11. Linn State Technical College *(June 13, 1996)*

Associate of applied science degree-granting institution with open/selective enrollment and a mission focusing on programmatic access to highly specialized technical education.

- Approved Linn State Technical College's mission enhancement strategic initiatives for FY 2002 – FY 2006 (October 12, 2000)

12. Community Colleges *(June 13, 1996)*

Associate degree-granting institutions with open enrollment admissions specializing in workforce development; Missouri's lead institutions in delivering postsecondary technical education in partnership with the state's area vocational technical schools.

- Approved community colleges' mission implementation and targeted service initiatives for FY 2002 – FY 2006 (*October 12, 2000*)

3. Quality Goals Related to Mission

NOTE: Several issues currently underway, including the development of a new strategic plan and redesigned higher education funding policies, involve the development of performance measures. When these measures are developed, the following Quality Goals Related to Mission will be replaced.

Mission Differentiation by Admissions Guidelines

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Admission decisions at all public institutions will reflect the statewide admissions guidelines for standards appropriate to highly selective, selective, moderately selective, and open enrollment institutions.

- **Highly Selective:** Combined ACT percentile score and high school percentile rank total points which equal or exceed 140, automatic admission with an ACT test score of 27.
- **Selective:** Combined ACT percentile score and high school percentile rank total points which equal or exceed 120, automatic admission with an ACT test score of 24.
- **Moderately Selective:** Combined ACT percentile score and high school percentile rank total points which equal or exceed 100, automatic admission with an ACT test score of 21.
- **Open Admission:** Students may be admitted based on a high school diploma or its equivalent, but admission to selected programs is based on the program admissions standards.

Satisfactory Academic Progress • Success Rates

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996, and revised June 10, 1999)**

Success rates for all first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen, defined as the proportion of first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen completing 24 or more credit hours by the end of the first academic year and achieving a cumulative college grade point average of 2.0 or better, shall equal or exceed the following:

- 90 percent at highly selective institutions
- 80 percent at selective institutions
- 70 percent at moderately selective institutions
- 55 percent at open-enrollment institutions

Graduation and Time-to-Completion Rates

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Graduation and time-to-completion rates for first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen shall equal or exceed the following. Graduation rates for minority students will be comparable to those attained for all students.

- 75 percent after 6 years at highly selective institutions
- 65 percent after 6 years at selective institutions
- 55 percent after 6 years at moderately selective institutions
- 45 percent after 6 years at open-enrollment four-year institutions
- 25 percent after 3 years at public two-year community colleges

Remediation

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

All Missouri colleges and universities will provide appropriate instructional and student support services. No public four-year institution which is highly selective or selective will offer formal remedial coursework.

Faculty Workload

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Missouri's public four-year institutions will adopt work load policies that result in average teaching assignments for all tenured and tenure-track faculty by institutional type consistent with the following:

- 9 hours at highly selective, selective, and research institutions
- 12 hours at all other public four-year institutions

Students Below Thirty-Third Percentile

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

No first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshmen or transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours who attains a score on the ACT at or below the 33rd percentile, or its SAT equivalent, or have a high school class rank at or below the 33rd percentile, will be admitted to a public four-year college or university which is highly selective, selective, or moderately selective if they reside in a Missouri public community college district or out-of-state.

Nota Bene:

Students to whom this requirement would apply may be admitted to an institution as part of its 10 percent exception rate for admission purposes.

Transfers

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

The number of students successfully transferring from Missouri's two-year institutions and *completing* a baccalaureate degree at one of the state's public or independent four-year institutions will at least double the comparable rate of transfers for academic year 1990-91.

Highly Qualified Teachers

**(Adopted by the Board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

All newly certified public school teachers entering the profession must be as highly qualified as possible:

- By 1996, 90 percent of the students admitted to state-approved teacher education programs will attain an Enhanced ACT Composite Score at the 66th percentile and/or an equivalent score of 265 on the C-BASE, or above.
- 80 percent of the prospective secondary classroom teachers will attain a level of performance on nationally normed Major Field Achievement Tests in their content field which equals or exceeds the national average, i.e., at or above the 50th percentile.
- Exit assessment score on the National Teacher Examination (NTE) for at least 90 percent of the newly certified teachers will equal or exceed the national average, i.e., at or above the 50th percentile.

Minority Participation

(1) ***Minority Students*** (Adopted by the board December 10, 1992; reaffirmed April 18, 1996)

Minorities will participate and succeed in Missouri's system of higher education in proportions at least equal to their representation in the state of Missouri. This was broadened in 1996 to include the educationally disadvantaged students.

(2) ***Increasing Minority Employment*** (Adopted by the board December 10, 1992; reaffirmed April 18, 1996)

The aggregate number of minorities employed statewide in all public and independent institutions collectively as faculty and administrative staff will at least equal their representation in the state of Missouri.

Critical Skills and Disciplines

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

The number of students completing programs of study in those high-skill trades and determined to be critical to Missouri's future, and/or in short supply (e.g., machinists, maintenance mechanics, tool and die makers, manufacturing technologies, the physical and life sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, allied health, and nursing) will more than double over the number of degrees conferred in these areas for academic year 1990-91.

Mission Enhancement Accountability Measures

(Adopted by the board June 11, 1998)

The accountability measures established a limited number of high priority outcome measures that will demonstrate how each institution is different at the end of the mission review cycle as a result of the state's investment in mission enhancement. The expectation is that the report each institution prepares describing the results of the state's investment in its mission enhancement will contain these high priority outcome measures as well as other information developed by the institution. The institutions will present their reports to the CBHE during April meetings.

B. INSTITUTIONAL NOMENCLATURE

**(Adopted by the board June 11, 1998;
revised October 10, 2002)**

Because a name change by one institution in a state-supported system affects every institution in the system and the system itself, those responsible for approving and implementing a name change should consider the following when evaluating proposals to change an institution's name.

1. Institutional names should reflect the institution's mission, role, and scope of program delivery within the state's system of higher education.
2. Compass point names, e.g., North, Northeast, etc., should accurately reflect an institution's specific service region. Unique and distinctive names that do not imply a specific service region may be appropriate.
3. New public two-year community college names should reflect their community-based mission.
4. Marketing should not be the primary reason for an institution to change its name.
5. A name change should not justify or require additional state resources.

C. INFORMATION AND DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

1. Accountability Report

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education shall issue an annual accountability report for Missouri's system of higher education which shall describe the success of Missouri's public and independent colleges and universities in attaining agreed upon statewide goals. All institutions eligible to participate in the Missouri Student Grant Program will submit to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education the appropriate data for every category of the accountability report.

2. Performance of Missouri's Public High School Graduates Report

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education shall collect the necessary data from Missouri's public colleges and universities to meet the Board's requirement to report annually to the State Board of Education on the performance of Missouri's public high school graduates in the state's public colleges and universities as required by the Outstanding Schools Act, S.B. 380 (173.750 RSMo).

D. OFF-CAMPUS AND OUT-OF-DISTRICT INSTRUCTION

1. Clarification of the Operations and Funding of 1456 Sites Established by the General Assembly

(Adopted by the board June 8, 2000)

In order to clarify the operations and funding of 1456 sites established by the General Assembly, the CBHE limited the eligibility of FY 2002 inflationary increases of selected off-campus and out-of-district instruction sites until such time as the sponsoring institution(s) submit appropriate proposals and meet the requirements and guidelines of state statutes and CBHE administrative rules pertaining to HB 1456 sites. The Coordinating Board also directed the commissioner of higher education that prior to recommending approval of any new HB 1456 proposal, that the sponsoring institution(s) take into consideration the following additional provisions, including: evidence of collaboration with other institutions, evidence of maintaining state aid requests at a maximum of fifty (50%) percent of total cost, evidence of utilization of electronic delivery of instruction, and evidence of consideration

given to encouraging local school districts to annex to a sponsoring community college district.

2. Collaboration Among Proposed 1456 Sites and Existing Institutions

**(Adopted by the board October 12, 2000;
revised April 10, 2008)**

The board recommended that the commissioner and staff continue to work with the institutions that proposed HB 1456 sites to fully explore cooperative arrangements in consultation with public and independent institutions seeking to serve a proposed community, e.g.: Edina, Hannibal, and Kennett and to fully explore better use of telecommunications for expanded program and course delivery.

The community of Sikeston meets the CBHE HB 1456 criteria for designation as an HB 1456 site, and postsecondary institutions serving that community are eligible to apply for and receive funding under HB 1456.

3. Lack of Compelling Need for Additional 1456 Sites

(Adopted by the board October 12, 2000)

The board determined that there is no compelling need for additional HB 1456 sites since:

- There currently are nine approved HB 1456 sites;
- The state's public community colleges now have \$25 million in their core budgets which encourage AAS degree program development on campus and delivery of AAS courses and programs in cooperation with AVTSs across the respective community college voluntary service regions;
- The goal of the Missouri Learners' Network and a public community colleges' FY 2002-2006 mission enhancement initiative is to provide a universal state-wide Associate of Arts degree via the Internet;
- Selected four-year public institutions have mission enhancement funds designated for outreach initiatives; and
- Several of Missouri's 25 independent colleges and universities have articulated off-campus programs and instructional locations across the state that provide additional geographic and programmatic access to Missouri higher education.

4. 1456 Sites in the Lake of the Ozarks Area

(Adopted by the board October 12, 2000)

The Coordinating Board voted to notify the Lake of the Ozarks Community College Steering Committee that it will comply with the committee's request that the Board will cease to grant any future approval of 1456 sites in the Lake of the Ozarks Area, and that State Fair Community College will not be allowed to expand its services in the Lake area until resolution of the steering committee's proposal to establish a new community college taxing district in the Lake of the Ozarks region of the state.

E. COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1. Community College Subdistricting Plans

Under provisions set forth in Section 178.820, RSMo the Coordinating Board for Higher Education accepts from involved junior (community) college boards of trustees, a resolution calling for the formation of a local subdistricting committee and the approval or disapproval of subdistricting plans.

Sections 178.820, RSMo provides that within 90 days following the publication of the decennial census figures by the state demographer, the boards of trustees of all junior (community) college districts containing over 450,000 residents shall adopt a resolution calling for the creation of a subdistricting committee. Any other junior (community) college district may voluntarily resolve to request such a subdistricting committee at any duly called meeting if its trustees.

A subdistricting committee is to be comprised of six (6) residents of the junior (community) college district, three (3) appointed by the board of trustees, and three (3) by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. Through resolution, the board of trustees shall submit the names and resumes of six residents of the district from which the Coordinating Board may select its three appointments to the subdistricting committee. Coordinating Board staff will review the resumes of the six residents. Based upon the candidates' experience and qualifications, as well as to assure district-wide geographic representation, the staff will identify three candidates for the Board's consideration who best seem to meet the needs of the subdistricting committee.

The subdistricting committee is to adopt a plan dividing the junior (community) college district into no fewer than (2) and no more than six (6) subdistricts for community college districts containing less than 450,000 residents. For the purpose of electing boards of trustees, the subdistricts' population shall be apportioned so as to be

substantially equal for each trustee elected. No modification of the community college's district boundaries is involved.

The plan adopted by the subdistricting committee must be approved by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, and until such approval is granted, election of trustees shall be at large. In most cases, the community colleges must have completed these CBHE approved processes by October or December of the year preceding community colleges boards of trustees' elections in April of the following year. Board of trustees candidates for election must establish residency based on the revised or new subdistricting plan approved by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

On April 12, 2001, the Coordinating Board resolved that in the future requests for appointees to subdistricting committees should include a list of committee members appointed by the local college board of trustees, demographics of the district, and should be reflective of the diversity of that particular community college district.

2. Community Colleges' Mission, Role, and Scope Statements

(Adopted by the board October 7, 1999)

The enactment of Senate Bill 340 in June 1995, (Section 173.030(7) and (8), RSMo directed the Coordinating Board for Higher Education to review every five years the mission of the state's public two- and four-year colleges. Included in that legislation is a provision authorizing the board to recommend an additional investment to enhance an institution's mission based on a mission implementation plan approved by the Coordinating Board. At the April 1999 CBHE meeting, the board initiated a mission review of the public community colleges. This action required that the first step in the community college mission review process is the development of mission, role and scope statements. The board adopted the following mission, role and scope statements on October 7, 1999.

Mission

Associate degree-granting institutions with open enrollment admissions specializing in workforce development; and Missouri's lead institutions in delivering postsecondary technical education in partnership with the state's vocational technical schools.

Role

Community colleges fulfill their role within the state's system of postsecondary education by:

- Providing within their respective taxing districts, certificate and associate degree programs, entry-level and advanced technical

skill preparation, retraining and upgrading of the workforce, including adult literacy and adult basic skills development;

- Providing within taxing districts and respective designated voluntary service regions as provided for by state law (HB 1456, Sections 163.191 (4), and 173.030 (4), RSMo), and approved statewide plans for higher education, including the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education*, (Section 178.637 (2), RSMo).
- Providing lower division general education program preparation for students who wish to transfer to private or public colleges and universities; and
- Implementing in partnership with area vocational technical schools, selected baccalaureate degree colleges and universities, Linn State Technical College, private career schools (proprietary), labor organizations, and the West Plains campus of SMSU, the *State Plan for Technical Education* (Section 178.637 (2), RSMo).

Scope

The scope, or level, of community college education in Missouri is defined by statute (Section 163.191 (5), RSMo) and included in the Coordinating Board's public policy initiatives and statewide planning for Missouri higher education. The scope of community college education includes:

- Providing technical certificates that stand alone or link to associate of applied science degrees in occupational and career programs leading to immediate business, government, and industry employment;
- Providing employer-contracted noncredit and customized training programs for employees who need new or upgraded skills to improve job readiness and performance;
- Providing associate of arts, associate of science, and associate of applied science degree programs that enable students to transfer to upper-division institutions for completing articulated baccalaureate degree programs;
- Providing adult basic education (including GED testing), basic skill development and remediation that prepare students to enter college-level coursework; and
- Engaging in cooperative instructional delivery systems, including MOREnet and MOBIUS, that maximize the use of technology to deliver associate degree lower division general education and technical education coursework.

F. POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION

1. Vocational Education

On June 18, 1986, the board endorsed recommendations to the State Council on Vocational Education that:

Without question, articulation between secondary and postsecondary vocational programs at the various levels is essential and it may also be central to reducing the problems of overlapping purposes.

The focus of articulation and mission refinement should be on assuring that students are well prepared in the basic skills of reading, computation, communication, and learning before they progress to in depth study of specific job skills.

Throughout vocational programs the goal should be to broaden the range of jobs for which students are prepared rather than increase specialization.

The governance, coordination, and funding of vocational education must be reshaped in a manner that will bring greater focus and efficiency to state policy.

There is a need for both consolidation of some area vocational technical schools and community colleges and development of some area vocational technical schools into technical institutes with the authority and resources to confer associate of applied science type degrees. The consolidations are needed in some areas of the state to minimize duplication in programming, equipment expenditures, and staffing. In other areas of the state access to technical degree programs can be achieved most efficiently by building on the existing area vocational technical schools. However, both the consolidations and expansions involve very significant issues of statutory authorization, funding, governance, voter approval, and need assessment.

Ultimately, state funding for vocational education, with the exception of the broadest based job skills and technical education, should be based on placement of students in related occupations and articulated programs of additional education

2. Access to Vocational Technical Programs

On September 9, 1993, the board:

Endorsed voluntary community service regions proposed by the community college association providing statewide coverage for vocational technical education by Missouri's community colleges and area vocational schools.

3. State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education

(Adopted by the board June 13, 1996)

Missouri's state plan for the delivery of postsecondary technical education fulfills the vision for a strengthened system of postsecondary technical education the Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopted in 1992 as part of its goals for Missouri higher education. In addition, the plan for postsecondary technical education responds to the mandate given the Coordinating Board by the General Assembly in Section 178.637.7, RSMo (Senate Bill 101, 1995).

Senate Bill 101 directed the Coordinating Board for Higher Education to develop, in cooperation with the State Board of Education, a master plan that coordinates area vocational technical schools, community colleges, and Linn State Technical College in providing advanced technical education and training for the state of Missouri. The plan, provides the framework for building articulated courses and programs in technical education to prepare high skill and high wage technicians for employment in the manufacturing sector of Missouri's economy. The state plan ensures a seamless transition from vocational education and Tech-Prep initiatives at the secondary level to associate of applied science and baccalaureate courses and programs for those who choose to enroll at the postsecondary level.

Partners in delivering the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education* include the 57 area vocational technical schools, Linn State Technical College, selected state baccalaureate institutions, including Missouri Western State College, Central Missouri State University, and Southeast Missouri State University. The University of Missouri—Rolla is recognized for its continued role in advanced science and manufacturing-related engineering research, program delivery, and technology transfer. The Council for Career and Technical Education in the College of Education at the University of Missouri-Columbia is recognized for its continued role in graduate education, research, and service to the vocational technical education community. The state's private career schools are recognized for their important role in offering the state a wide array and richly diversified system of postsecondary technical education.

The community college presidents/chancellors, with the advice and recommendations of the Regional Technical Education Councils, are responsible for developing and submitting a regional plan for strengthening and delivering postsecondary technical education within the region to be served.

4. State Planning and Coordination for Postsecondary Technical Education

(Adopted by the board June 13, 1996)

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education utilizes its statutory authority to strengthen and enhance the postsecondary technical education delivery system through the inclusion of all the state's public and private schools, colleges, and universities that are part of Missouri's associate of applied science degree program delivery system.

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education fosters and promotes the coordinated delivery of postsecondary technical education on a regional basis. In so doing, the board embraces the role of the state's public community colleges as the primary providers of postsecondary vocational technical education. Twelve (12) community college service regions developed for purposes of implementing the Missouri Community College New Jobs Training Program (Sections 178.892 through 178.896, RSMo) are the geographic regions within which regional level planning for the implementation of the state plan should occur. These regions were approved by the CBHE at the March 25, 1993 board meeting. These regions are entitled the "Community College Service Regions for the Delivery of Postsecondary Technical Education." Area vocational technical schools included within these regions are considered as part of the regional delivery system.

The purpose of the regional planning is to create Regional Technical Education Councils (RTECs) to collaborate in encouraging flexible environments where educational institutions that are in close proximity will work together to systematically enhance workforce education by developing coordinated plans. Regional employers and/or labor organizations must be represented on the RTECs. Other representatives on the Regional Technical Education Councils should come from across the service region as well as include at least one representative, as appropriate, from: manufacturing-related industries; local government; School-to-Work partnership(s), One-Stop-Career Center(s), and Regional Planning Commission(s), Private Industry Council(s), and vocational education advisory committee(s); the community college serving the identified region; area vocational technical school(s); comprehensive high schools; public and private baccalaureate degree-granting institution(s) within the identified region; and private career schools within the identified region.

The Coordinating Board encourages other providers of associate of applied science degree programs, both public and private, to join with the state's public community colleges in enhancing their efforts to provide statewide geographic, programmatic, and student access

to success. The *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education* is designed to develop new and enhance existing technical programs, and deliver them to students on the main campuses of the community colleges as well as to residents who do not reside within a community college district.

The State Board of Education, which is designated by state law as the State Board for Vocational Education has a strategic role in providing for the delivery of vocational technical education at the secondary and postsecondary level through the programs it supports at the state's comprehensive high schools, area vocational technical schools, and public two- and four-year colleges and universities. The actions of the State Board of Education, in cooperation with those of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, will support the regional planning and delivery concepts presented in the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education*.

The directors of the Department of Economic Development, Labor and Industrial Relations, Elementary and Secondary Education, Social Services, and Higher Education, are designated as the state-level technical education council and will provide for the overall coordination of state programs related to workforce preparation and development.

5. Approval of Fiscal Year Appropriation Requests and Distribution of Technical Funds Under the State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education

(Approved by the board October 10, 1996)

Each October, the board approves the CBHE budget request for the next fiscal year, including appropriation requests for the community colleges' Regional Technical Education Councils under the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education*. FY 1997 was the initial year to fund the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education*. As a result of SB 101 (1995) the CBHE board agreed to request technical education funding for five (5) fiscal years from FY 1997 through FY 2001. Effective FY 2002 all technical education funds will be distributed to the core budgets of each community college.

6. Refined State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education

(Adopted by the board June 12, 1997)

The initial year to implement the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education* was FY 1997. As a result of administering the state plan during the first year, there were a few issues that needed to be clarified to avoid further confusion and prevent future unintended consequences. In March 1997, the commissioner called a meeting

with members of the original technical education resource group and other professionals close to the *State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education* to confer and clarify key points in the plan. At the June 12, 1997 CBHE meeting, the following issues and clarifications were adopted:

Established criteria for the approval of new AAS degree programs which include:

- a. an institutional mission with an open admissions policy with selective admission policies appropriate to certain programs;
- b. historical and current ties to, as well as course and program articulation agreements with, local and/or regional area vocational technical schools;
- c. a heritage in the junior or community college tradition that not only continues to be embraced by those the institution now serves but is part of the campus culture as well, OR a public two-year college or private school offering certificate, diploma, associate and/or baccalaureate degree programs in technical fields;
- d. existing CBHE approved certificate, associate of applied science and/or other
- e. current and historical role within the local, regional, or state system of higher education;
- f. an appropriate scope and level of approved certificate and associate degree programs; and Procedure for the Review of Academic Program Proposals.

The board also:

- Agreed that if a new AAS degree program is approved at a four-year public institution it is not meant to establish a precedent for public four-year institutions to propose other new AAS degree programs.
- Supported the community colleges in establishing one fee for out-of-district students effective with the fall 1997 semester by embracing the effort of individual community college governing boards in establishing a single out-of-district student fee appropriate to each college's fee schedule and costs of course and program delivery.
- Supported the concept of establishing Higher Education Centers (HECs) through policy and procedures related to RSMo 163.191.4 and 173.030 (4) and 6 CSR 10-6.030 (HB 1456) by considering, and if appropriate, approving recommendations by the staff that a center should be established and that state funding

should be requested in support for the operations of an individual center.

- Accepted the appeal procedure described in the June 12, 1997 report of Clarification of Emerging Issues Related to the Implementation of the State Plan for Postsecondary Education.
- Requested the commissioner of higher education to convene future meetings of appropriate parties and interest groups to discuss ways Moberly Area Community College can be assisted in meeting postsecondary education needs in northeast Missouri.

G. OUT-OF-STATE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS THAT OFFER INSTRUCTION IN MISSOURI

(Promulgation authorized by the board December 6, 2007)

6 CSR 10-10.010 Out-of-State Public Institutions

(1) Definitions.

- (A) CBHE: The Coordinating Board for Higher Education created by § 173.005(2), RSMo.
- (B) MDHE: The Missouri Department of Higher Education created by § 173.005(1), RSMo.
- (C) Out-of-state public institution: An educational institution as defined by § 173.005.11(a), RSMo.
- (D) Course: A defined and unique educational offering with discrete objectives and requirements in support of a program, whether conducted in person, by mail, or through any telecommunication medium.
- (E) Program: A complete academic or vocational educational offering that fulfills the requirements for the awarding of a certificate or a degree. A program may consist of one or more courses and shall, upon satisfactory completion, fulfill an academic, occupational, or other training objective.
- (F) Offer: To enroll or seek to enroll anyone residing in the state of Missouri in a course or program beyond the high school level.

- (2) No out-of-state public institution shall offer programs or courses in Missouri without receiving prior approval of the CBHE to do so.

Failure to seek and receive approval prior to the delivery of instruction and/or the enrollment of students shall be sufficient cause to deny approval to offer courses or programs.

- (3) Approval from the CBHE to offer programs or courses shall be valid for a period of no more than three years. During the period of approval, the out-of-state public institution must provide annual data reports concerning their operations in Missouri as specified by the MDHE.
- (4) Degree Program Approval: As of July 1, 2008, the standards for approving degree programs of out-of-state public institutions will be substantially identical to the standards for Missouri public institutions of higher education, with the exception of the standards relating to program financing. The proposal components will be those required by the MDHE under the “Policies and Procedures for the Review of Academic Program Proposals” adopted by the CBHE on April 17, 1997 and standards for approval will be those specified in that policy.
- (5) Course Approval: All courses offered by an out-of-state public institution that are not creditable toward a degree program approved by the MDHE for delivery in Missouri must meet, as determined by the MDHE, the following criteria in order to be approved by the CBHE:
 - (A) The course must be applicable to a recognized program offered by the delivering institution on its home campus;
 - (B) The course must be of adequate content and duration so as to be considered consistent with similar coursework offered on the institution’s home campus or with coursework in the same subject area offered by other higher education institutions;
 - (C) The course must be taught by regular institutional faculty with educational and experiential qualifications that, in the judgment of the MDHE, are in excess of the level of the program to which the course is applicable;
 - (D) Students enrolling in the course must have access to adequate academic and student support services, including but not limited to advising, library, financial assistance, and technical assistance;
 - (E) Students enrolling in the course must have access to adequate information regarding the course content and objectives, all costs associated with enrollment, and the

applicability of the course to degree programs offered by the delivering institution; and

- (F) Courses offered by telecommunication means must have evidence of sufficient support from the home campus to ensure students have the means to achieve the stated objectives in a manner consistent with students enrolled on the home campus and must be aligned with the “Principles of Good Practice for Distance-Learning/Web-Based Courses” adopted by the CBHE on April 13, 2000.

(6) In order to be approved, the applicant institution must:

- (A) Provide documentation that the courses and programs offered by the institution in Missouri are included within the scope of accreditation currently granted by the institution’s recognized accrediting body and, as applicable, any applicable programmatic accrediting agency; and
 - (B) Agree to comply with all CBHE policies relating to data collection, cooperation, and resolution of disputes.
- (7) Nothing in this regulation shall be construed or interpreted so that students attending an out-of-state public institution of higher education are considered to be attending a Missouri public institution of higher education for purposes of obtaining student financial assistance.

III. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

A. COLLEGE ADMISSIONS

1. High School Student Preparation: CBHE-Recommended High School Core Curriculum Guidelines

NOTE: The board approved new Core Curriculum Requirements for High School students at its June 14, 2006, meeting. Those requirements will not be in full effect until the high school class of 2010 graduates. For that reason, both the old guidelines, which are still in effect, and the new guidelines are set forth here.

a. Old Guidelines

All first-time full-time degree-seeking freshmen and transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours at another institution who enroll at Missouri's four-year colleges and universities will have completed the following CBHE recommended high school core curriculum. (*December 10, 1992 – Reaffirmed April 18, 1996*)

(1) Delineation of 16-Unit High School Core Curriculum (Adopted by the board June 13, 1996)

CBHE Recommended High School Core Curriculum

ENGLISH

At least four units, one of which may be speech or debate, and two units of which must be in courses emphasizing composition or writing skills.

Examples of courses generally acceptable toward the four units: English or language arts I, II, III, and IV, literature courses, journalism (if writing intensive), speech and debate. Applied Communications or Communications 2000, developed by the Agency for Instructional Technology (AIT), may be counted as one unit of English.

Examples of unacceptable courses: yearbook, school publications, acting, theater, dramatics, business English, mass media and photography.

MATHEMATICS

At least three units, high school level algebra and beyond, including algebra II.

Examples of courses generally acceptable toward the three units: algebra I, plane geometry, algebra II, pre-calculus, trigonometry,

analytic geometry, calculus and math analysis. Applied mathematics II and applied mathematics III, developed by the Center for Occupational Research and Development (CORD), may each be counted as one unit beyond algebra I. Standard algebra courses that have been subdivided, e.g., algebra I is divided into algebra IA and IB, may be counted only as one course unit.

Examples of unacceptable courses: computer math, computer programming, consumer math, computer science, pre-algebra, basic math, general math, terminal math, business math and accounting, and applied mathematics I, developed by the Center for Occupational Research and Development (CORD).

SOCIAL STUDIES

At least three units, including American history and at least one semester of government.

Examples of courses generally acceptable toward the three units: world history, American history, American government, civics, principles of democracy, economics, psychology, sociology, political science and geography. Applied economics developed by the Agency for Instructional Technology (AIT) may be counted as one unit of social science.

Examples of unacceptable courses: regional history, family living, family relations, marriage and family, consumer education, and courses generally listed under “practical arts” or “human environmental science.”

SCIENCE

At least two units (not including general science), selected from biology, chemistry, or physics, one of which is a laboratory course.

Examples of courses generally acceptable toward the two units: botany, zoology, anatomy and physiology, biology, chemistry and physics. If taught for a full two years, applied biology/chemistry, developed by the Center for Occupational Research and Development (CORD), may be counted as two units of a laboratory science. If applied biology/chemistry is taught for only one year, then it may be counted as one unit, of a laboratory science--content area depends on curriculum covered and training of the instructor. Principles of technology (PT-1 and PT-2), developed by the Center for Occupational Research and Development, may be counted as one unit of a laboratory science.

Examples of unacceptable courses: life science, physical science, and earth science if not taught at the high school level in a rigor comparable to biology, chemistry, or physics; also, consumer science, outdoor education and environmental studies.

VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

At least one unit of fine arts courses in the visual arts, music, dance, and theatre.

Examples of courses generally acceptable toward the one unit: art I, II, III, and IV, sculpture, design, drawing, painting, theater, oral interpretation, dance, dramatics, band and any other instrumental music, chorus and any other vocal music courses, and art, music, or theatre appreciation courses.

Examples of unacceptable courses: speech, debate, radio and television, mass media, stagecraft, arts and crafts.

SPECIFIED CORE ELECTIVES

Three units selected from foreign language (two units of one foreign language are strongly recommended) and/or combinations from two or more of the following course areas: English, mathematics, social studies, science, visual and performing arts. A computer science course with a prerequisite of at least algebra I is permissible as a mathematics elective. State and/or international history courses are permissible as social studies electives.

(2) Middle/Junior High School Courses (Adopted by the board October 13, 1994)

Courses taken by middle/junior high school students in mathematics and foreign language may be counted as satisfying the high school core curriculum requirement if the content is equivalent to high school courses (e.g. foreign language I and algebra I) and if subsequent courses in the subject are shown on the high school transcript (e.g., foreign language II and algebra II).

(3) Core Curriculum Requirement Implementation—Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Possible Exceptions (Adopted by the board June 15, 1995)

(a) The Coordinating Board for Higher Education should appoint permanent Advisory Committee on Implementation of the Minimum Core Curriculum Requirement to consist of representatives from each public four-year institution, three representatives from the public two-year sector, a representative from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and at least three representatives selected from public and independent high school counselors.

(b) Exempt group should be limited to international students and nontraditional students, i.e., students who have been out of high school for 5 years.

(c) The minimum core should be broadly applied to all other student groups for which the minimum core curriculum requirement is applicable, e.g., out-of-state, home-schooled, learning-disabled, nonaccredited high school, graduates of high schools without the core, etc. Students lacking the core should be evaluated based on an institution's professional judgment using such measures as ACT composite score, ACT sub-score, etc. No maximum percentage for professional judgment is set at this time; however, students lacking the core should be evaluated individually and should be able to demonstrate a potential for academic success comparable to students with the core.

(d) Institutions should collect and report to the CBHE specific data regarding student and institutional compliance with the minimum core curriculum requirement. Such data will be used by the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee to make more specific implementation recommendations.

(e) The CBHE staff should facilitate the development of common course reporting forms for both students and high school.

(f) The minimum core curriculum requirement should apply to all public four-year institutions.

(g) If admissions data indicate a particular problem for open-enrollment institutions, the CBHE can adopt a professional judgment criteria that reflect differences in institutional missions.

New Guidelines

(Adopted by the board June 14, 2006)

The CBHE, the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE), Missouri postsecondary institutions, and the Missouri K-12 community share a common interest in promoting student preparation as a foundation of enrollment, retention, and success in Missouri postsecondary institutions.

Accordingly, with collaboration across educational sectors, the CBHE has established a recommended 24-unit high school core curriculum guideline for students who plan to enroll in a Missouri college or university. The CBHE 24-unit high school core curriculum is designed to prepare high school students for access to and retention/success in collegiate-level work. Students are expected to demonstrate competency in high school core content. Failure to do so may result in placement in developmental/remedial coursework at additional time and expense to the student.

The CBHE encourages governing boards at Missouri's postsecondary institutions to incorporate the 24-unit high school core curriculum into admissions processes for all first-time freshmen; however,

admissions and placement decisions are ultimately made at the institutional level. Requirements vary for admission to Missouri institutions. For example, foreign language study is required for admission to some institutions. Students are strongly encouraged to discuss admissions requirements and placement practices with staff at Missouri institutions in which they may be interested in enrolling.

The CBHE 24-unit high school core curriculum is recommended for full implementation beginning with the Missouri high school graduating class of 2010.

CBHE-Recommended High School Core Curriculum

- English/Language Arts - 4 units
- Social Studies - 3 units
- Mathematics - 3 units
- Science - 3 units
- Fine Arts - 1 unit
- Additional Coursework - 3 units *
- Electives - 7 units **

* Missouri public high school students are required by the State Board of Education to complete units in practical arts (1), physical education (1), health education (1/2), and personal finance (1/2)

** All students should complete at least 3 elective units total in foreign language and/or other courses within high school core content areas defined below. Two units of a single foreign language are strongly recommended.

For each high school core content area, descriptions follow that provide illustrations of coursework acceptable and unacceptable for the high school core curriculum.

English/Language Arts

English/language arts coursework (4 units) emphasizes college preparatory composition, research skills, analysis of literature, and other content of comparable or greater rigor. Speech and debate courses may be included.

Coursework not acceptable for the high school core curriculum emphasizes student publications, broadcast media, or theater.

Social Studies

Social studies coursework (3 units) emphasizes American history, Missouri government and Missouri history as required by state statute, geography/world civilizations, and other content of comparable or greater rigor.

Coursework not acceptable for the high school core curriculum emphasizes family/human development or consumer education.

Mathematics

Mathematics coursework (3 units) emphasizes college preparatory algebra and other content of comparable or greater rigor. Students who complete algebra prior to the freshman year would be expected to complete 3 additional units in grades 9-12.

Coursework not acceptable for the high school core curriculum emphasizes pre-algebra, computer math/programming, consumer/basic math, or business math/accounting.

Science

Science coursework (3 units) emphasizes college preparatory biology, chemistry, and other content of comparable or greater rigor. Science coursework should include at least one laboratory course.

Coursework not acceptable for the high school core curriculum emphasizes general or consumer science.

Fine Arts

Fine arts coursework (1 unit) emphasizes visual arts, instrumental or vocal music, dance, theater, or other content of comparable or greater rigor. Critical analysis, theory, or "appreciation" courses may be included.

Coursework not acceptable for the high school core curriculum emphasizes speech, debate, or broadcast media.

2. Advanced Credit Opportunities

a. Advanced Placement

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Every Missouri high school will provide opportunities for advanced placement offerings.

Dual-Credit Policy

**(Guidelines adopted by the board February 28, 1992, and revised
June 10, 1999; clarifying comments adopted
October 7, 1999)**

Introduction

Dual credit courses enable high school students to receive, simultaneously, both high school and college-level course credit. They provide high-performing high school students an affordable opportunity to experience high-quality college-level courses. Dual credit *courses* may be taught by full-time college faculty who instruct high school students either on campus or in the high school via on-site instruction or interactive television. Dual credit courses may also be taught using the same modes of delivery by adjunct faculty who may teach part-time both on the college campus and at the high school site. However, the large majority of dual credit courses are taught by high school faculty, with supervision by on-campus college faculty. The policy guidelines described below apply only to dual credit general education courses offered in high schools by high school teachers to high school students. These guidelines do not address technically oriented dual credit courses offered by some colleges. (Technically oriented courses refer to those courses that comprise the technical part of the AAS degree, such as electronics.)

Over the past several years, there has been substantial growth and expansion of dual credit programs involving high school faculty, with increases in the number of student credit hours generated and in the number of high school students, teachers, and schools participating in dual credit programs. Given this growth and expansion, the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) recognizes the necessity of revising its 1992 policy.

Statutory References

According to Section 167.223, RSMo (1990), public high schools, in cooperation with Missouri public community colleges and public or private four-year colleges and universities, may offer postsecondary course options to high school juniors and seniors. Section 167.223, RSMo, was amended in 1998 to expand eligibility for dual credit enrollment to high school freshmen and sophomores.

Guiding Principles

Dual credit courses achieve multiple purposes. The primary purpose of offering dual credit courses is to deliver high-quality college experiences to high-performing high school students. Dual credit courses are suitable to challenge students who have mastered or nearly mastered the complete high school curriculum and who require college-level coursework that is more rigorous than the high

school curriculum. Dual credit courses also enrich and extend the high school curriculum, provide introductory college coursework, and avoid unnecessary duplication in coursework as students move from high school to college. Over time, as the technological means becomes more efficient in delivering dual credit courses from a distance, on-campus professors and instructors in the high school will be able to work even more closely as instructional collaborators in delivering college courses to high school students.

The policy guidelines described below were developed within the context of this stated purpose and apply only to dual credit general education courses offered in high schools, by high school teachers. These policy guidelines do not address technically oriented dual credit courses.

The policy guidelines for the delivery of dual credit courses denote quality standards that apply in most instances. However, there are instances in which the implementation of the standards may differ from the stated guidelines. For these instances, the institution must provide a rationale and plan to ensure the quality of the dual credit offering for these exceptions (see section on Evidence for Policy Compliance).

Student Eligibility

The eligibility of high school students to participate in dual credit courses may vary in accordance with the admission standards of the college or university offering the courses in the high school. For all institutions, however, students must have a minimum overall grade-point average of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) or the equivalent, and be recommended by the high school principal or his or her official designee.

High school students must also meet the same requirements for admission to individual courses (e.g., English or mathematics) as those required of on-campus students (e.g., ACT, ASSET, or other placement test scores). Specific placement tests may not be required for admission to some college courses; however, if the high school administers a competency assessment in an area related to the dual credit course, high school juniors and seniors must score at proficient or above on the MAP or achieve an equivalent score on a comparable assessment. Performance on the MAP or a related assessment test should be verified in the high school principal's or official designee's recommendation that the student participate in a dual credit course.

High school juniors and seniors who meet the above requirements will be eligible for dual credit courses. Under special circumstances, freshmen and sophomores with superior academic talents may take dual credit courses. Freshmen and sophomores must demonstrate their competency by scoring at the 90th percentile or above on the

ACT or SAT. Moreover, the recommending high school counselor and the college academic department official must concur that a younger student can benefit from dual credit in the specific course and learn at the collegiate level.

Program Structure and Administration

Dual credit courses offered in high schools must duplicate the identical course offerings delivered on campus to matriculated students. Courses must be approved for dual credit status, and the credit awarded must be deemed acceptable in transfer by the faculty of the appropriate academic department (unit) of the college. Elements of the dual credit course to be approved by the on-campus college faculty in the appropriate academic discipline include the syllabus, textbook(s), teaching methodology, and student assessment strategies. Course content and course requirements must be comparable to those utilized in the equivalent on-campus courses with the same titles. The chief academic officer of the postsecondary institution will also be responsible for involving full-time faculty in the discipline in the selection and evaluation of all dual credit faculty. The on-campus college faculty must also ensure comparable standards of evaluation.

Because discrete classes that totally separate dual credit from non-dual credit students may be prohibitive to operate in some cases, those classes with a mixed population must show evidence of collegiate level expectations for all students in the course. All high school students enrolled in a dual credit course must meet the same requirements for completion of the course, whether or not the student is simultaneously registered for college credit.

Students enrolled in dual credit classes must adhere to the dates comparable to those specified on the college campus for registration, drop, withdrawal, or refund.

Clarifying Comment: The intent of the policy is to prevent retroactive registration, a practice that permits students to choose whether to register for courses for college credit late in the semester. The policy is not intended to create logistical problems. On-campus and dual credit academic calendars should be comparable; program directors may exercise reasonable discretion with respect to registrations, payments, drops, withdrawals, and refunds.

Students in dual credit courses must have geographic access to student and academic support similar to that accorded students on the college campus, including access to library resources of similar scope and magnitude as those available to students enrolled in courses with the same titles on the college campus. Library materials must be available either on site at the high school or through electronic means. Dual credit students must have reasonable

access to the course instructor outside regular classroom hours either in person, via phone, and/or through other electronic means.

Institutions shall not use fees as a means of competing for dual credit students and shall work cooperatively when providing dual credit courses in the same geographic area. Institutions should use the same credit hour fee for all dual credit courses, regardless of the site.

Clarifying comment: An institution's price for dual credit courses should be consistent from high school to high school. Actual costs may vary for a number of reasons. Quality controls should not be sacrificed in order to provide institutions with a competitive financial edge.

The chief academic officer of the college or university, being responsible for the academic quality of courses delivered on the college campus, is also accountable for the implementation of this policy and for assuring the integrity and quality of all dual credit courses.

Faculty Qualifications and Support

As for any instructor of college-level courses, high school instructors of dual credit courses shall meet the requirements for faculty teaching in institutions of higher education, as stipulated for accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Accordingly, high school instructors teaching general education courses shall typically have a master's degree that includes substantial study (usually a minimum of 18 semester hours) appropriate to the academic field in which they are teaching. The selection of high school instructors for dual credit courses must be approved both by the high school and by the chief academic officer of the postsecondary institution as described above. The responsibility for the orientation and evaluation of dual credit instructors rests with the college's academic departments, with guidance from the chief academic officer to ensure consistency across academic departments.

New dual credit instructors will participate in orientation activities provided by the college and/or academic department. Continuing dual credit instructors must participate in both the professional development and evaluation activities as those expected of adjunct faculty on the college campus. In order to assure comparability of the dual credit course with the corresponding experience on the college campus, college academic departments must provide instructors of dual credit courses with support services, including a designated on-campus faculty member to serve as a liaison. Dual credit instructors must be evaluated according to the college's evaluation policies for other part-time/adjunct faculty, with the recommendation for continuation being the responsibility of the campus academic

department. Thus, the institution of higher education must provide on-site supervision and evaluation of the dual credit faculty. This process is best served when the instructional site is within a reasonable commuting distance from the institution of higher education.

Assessment of Student Performance

The responsibility for the development of assessment and evaluation measures to assure quality and comparability of dual credit courses resides with the on-campus college faculty in the appropriate academic discipline. In general, comparability between the dual credit course taught in the high school and the corresponding course taught on the college campus should be demonstrated by using the same methods of assessment or identical testing procedures and by employing the same means of evaluation, which will be supervised by the appropriate faculty on the college campus.

In atypical cases, when different tests are constructed and independent evaluations are performed by the high school teacher, the burden shifts to the institution to demonstrate the comparability of dual credit courses and to ensure a common standard of grading. The use of nationally normed instruments is recommended when the substance of the normed test is consistent with the learning objectives of the dual credit course. Locally developed assessments must be administered to both on-campus and dual credit students in order to provide the on-campus college faculty in the appropriate academic discipline with data appropriate to demonstrate comparability. Nonetheless, any specialized assessment of dual credit courses must emulate the on-campus institutional assessment plan required by North Central Association Colleges and Schools, including the identification of the general education learning objectives and outcomes. Since the dual credit courses duplicate course offerings delivered on the college campus to matriculated students, both formative and summative assessment strategies and tools must be approved by the on-campus college faculty in the appropriate academic discipline. Annual reports of student performance must be submitted to the chief academic officer for both review and consideration with respect to the continuation of the dual credit instructor.

Transferability of Credit

Dual credit programs are not designed to replace a substantial segment of the academic experience on a college campus, but rather the programs are created to provide high-achieving high school students with opportunities for acceleration. High school students vary in their academic preparedness and in their capacity to complete collegiate-level work while in high school. The number of credit hours successfully completed by a high school student in dual credit programs will be related to her or his ability level. Since dual credit

programs are predicated on the portability of transcribed college credit, the following guideline should anchor the decisions made by the high school student and the receiving institution: students receiving dual credit from institutions in compliance with these policy guidelines can expect to transfer credit up to the equivalent of five courses.

Clarifying comment: Five courses shall be assured in transfer to all public institutions and independent/proprietary signatory institutions. “Equivalence of five courses” means five individual courses, regardless of the credit-hour value of those courses.

Students who wish to transfer more than five dual credit courses should consult the institution of higher education to which they intend to transfer in order to determine if the institution has a policy regarding the acceptance of dual credit courses used for the completion of a college degree.

Clarifying comment: All courses presented for transfer shall be evaluated based upon written transfer agreements in force among/between institutions. However, institutions shall be cognizant of the impact of their policy concerning courses above the assured five courses on articulated transfer agreements with other institutions. Institutions are encouraged to review their articulated transfer agreements’ consistency with their dual credit policies. Dual credit courses shall be evaluated on the same basis as on-campus courses for the purposes of transfer. Each institution’s dual credit acceptance policies shall be uniform. Institutional policies concerning dual credit should be applied equally to all institutions, including one’s own institution.

Students with dual credit transcribed courses who complete Associate of Arts (AA) degrees will be received in transfer the same as all AA degree transfer students.

The receiving institution should not, however, impose any limits that preclude high school juniors and seniors from earning additional credit through regular summer and/or evening enrollment in college courses taught by college faculty as allowed by dual enrollment, early admissions, or other college programs such as articulation agreements, advanced placement, or other accepted means of testing or granting credit.

Credit earned by students in dual credit courses that meet the above guidelines shall fall under the same CBHE guidelines as that for credit in college courses subject to transfer between public and independent institutions in the state of Missouri. College credit earned through dual credit courses offered in high schools shall be applicable toward associate and/or baccalaureate degree requirements and shall be eligible for transfer. All student rights and responsibilities as outlined in the CBHE’s 1998 Credit Transfer

Guidelines shall apply. Institutions must publicize their policies related to the acceptance of dual credit beyond the equivalent of five courses.

Evidence for Policy Compliance

Each institution will provide evidence demonstrating that the policy guidelines for the delivery of dual credit programs offered in high schools have been implemented. The chief academic officer of each institution offering dual credit courses must provide evidence concerning the implementation of the dual credit policy guidelines stated above in the sections on Student Eligibility, Program Structure and Administration, Faculty Qualifications and Support, Assessment of Student Performance, and Transferability of Credit. The institution may provide additional information in support of the quality and comparability of the dual credit courses to the same course offerings on the college campus, especially as those data support institutional exceptions to any of the policy guidelines. The CBHE will provide an updated list of dual credit programs that are in compliance with the above policy which will be shared annually with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and other interested constituents.

In addition, all institutions offering dual credit courses are required to report annually to the CBHE such things as the number of sections offered; the number of students enrolled (duplicated headcount) per high school; the total by class (year in high school); the number of high schools served by dual credit and the number of sections in each; the student credit-hour production (total for all dual credit and total per high school); the number of sections offered in mathematics, science, social sciences, and humanities; and summary data on the performance of dual credit students. A format for the annual reports will be developed. Dual credit data will be submitted to the CBHE when the institution submits its annual Performance Indicators Report. These policy guidelines shall be reviewed by COTA after three years based on annual reports submitted by institutions and reports on the academic progress of students who transfer dual credit.

Principles of Good Practice for Dual Credit Courses

(Adopted by the board October 7, 1999)

Introduction

These Principles of Good Practice are provided to facilitate the implementation of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education's 1999 Dual Credit Policy and are based on the following assumptions:

- The primary purpose of offering dual credit courses is to deliver high-quality introductory college-level courses to high-performing high school students.
- All faculty, whether full-time or adjunct (i.e., including high school faculty assigned to teach dual credit courses), will meet North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education standards.
- Dual credit programs are established through an arrangement between a high school with an established need and a Missouri institution of higher education.
- Each institution's full-time on-campus faculty will be actively involved in approving courses offered for dual credit in their discipline and in providing orientation and evaluation of dual credit instructors.
- Regular consultation and review on dual credit issues will occur with representatives of secondary school organizations participating in dual credit programs.
- All public institutions and each independent/proprietary institution that is a signatory to the 1998 Credit Transfer Policy agree to abide by the CBHE's dual credit policy.

The Principles of Good Practice

It is desirable that institutions in compliance with the statewide dual credit policy follow these agreed-upon principles of good practice. Although the structure and delivery of dual credit programs will vary among institutions, those variations should consistently reflect current policy. Institutional approaches to the delivery of dual credit courses should be consistent with an institution's mission while remaining aligned with state-level policy guidelines.

I. Dual credit programs should reflect a commitment to high quality and integrity.

- Each dual credit course should involve the same academic rigor and evaluation criteria as that of its campus-based equivalent.
- Institutions should establish procedures for the selection, training, evaluation, and mentoring of dual credit instructors.

II. Institutional context, commitment, and responsibilities should be clearly established.

- Institutions should establish dual credit relationships only with high schools that are within a reasonable commuting distance.

- Institutions of higher education should facilitate frequent, consistent, and timely communication with the high schools in which they provide dual credit courses. That communication should address the scheduling of courses, compliance with statewide dual credit policy, identification and resolution of problems that occur, and evaluation of each dual credit course.
- Institutions providing dual credit courses should assume responsibility to ensure and document the quality of dual credit practices by demonstrating compliance with the statewide dual credit policy.
- High schools and institutions providing dual credit courses should work cooperatively to ensure that students enrolled in those courses meet minimum qualifications as outlined in the statewide dual credit policy. A listing of students eligible to enroll in dual credit courses, as determined by GPA, test scores, and criteria described in the statewide dual credit policy, should be updated each semester.
- Institutions, in partnership with high school personnel, should ensure that instructors teaching dual credit courses meet the minimum qualifications as established by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education guidelines. Each institution's list of eligible dual credit teachers who meet the academic preparation requirements of the dual credit policy shall be updated each semester.
- Transfer and articulation officers should be familiar with their institution's dual credit policy and any agreements between their institutions and high schools in order to provide information to interested individuals.
- High school advisors should be familiar with the statewide dual credit policy as well as specific school/college agreements so as to provide accurate and sound advice to high school students.
- Colleges and universities involved in dual credit programs should provide dual credit instructors with both ongoing supervision by on-campus faculty and access to regular pedagogical and resource support such as professional development workshops.
- Students in dual credit courses should have access to student services and academic support similar to those accorded students on the traditional college campus, i.e., advisors, adequate library services, and other resources requisite for college-level academic performance.

III Institutions providing dual credit courses should develop and maintain procedures for evaluation and assessment.

- Institutions should maintain close alignment between dual credit courses taught in high schools and corresponding courses taught on college campuses by ensuring that dual credit assignments and grading criteria are identical to, or of comparable design, quality, and rigor to, the equivalent campus-based course. In circumstances where assignments and grading criteria are not identical, a rationale approved by the college's academic department must guide such modifications.
- Procedures for the supervision and evaluation of dual credit instructors should include activities such as:
 - Regular site visits to the high school by representatives of the institution of higher education;
 - Opportunities for dual credit instructors to discuss concerns and to share information with each other and with the institution of higher education;
 - Regular evaluation of dual credit instructors through methods identical to those used to evaluate their campus-based counterparts; and
 - Access to appropriate professional development opportunities and mentoring offered either exclusively to dual credit instructors or to both campus-based faculty and dual credit instructors.
- Institutions should assess, document, and transcript student achievement in each course.
- Based on prior academic performance, high school students should demonstrate a high likelihood of success in dual credit courses.

3. Selectivity and Missions for Public Institutions

(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)

Admissions decisions at all public institutions will reflect the statewide admission guidelines for standards appropriate to highly selective, selective, moderately selective, and open-enrollment institutions. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of each public four-year college or university to decide which of the following mission categories it will choose.

Highly selective institutions:

Admissions Selectivity Categories Summary

December 10, 1992

Reaffirmed on April 18, 1996

These categories apply to first-time, full-time degree seeking students and transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours:

	High School Percentile Plus ACT/SAT <u>Percentile</u>	Automatic <u>Admission</u>	Freshman Class % Allowable <u>Exception</u>
Highly selective or under	140	ACT Composite of 27	10% 139
Selective or under	120	ACT Composite of 24	10% 119
Moderately selective or under	100	ACT Composite of 21	10% 99
Open enrollment	N/A	N/A	N/A

Admit first-time full-time degree-seeking students, and transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours, who attain a combined percentile score, resulting from the addition of their high school percentile rank and the percentile rank attained on a nationally normed test, i.e., ACT or SAT, which equals or exceeds 140 points. Students achieving a score of 27 or better on the ACT College Entrance Examination, or its equivalent on the SAT, are automatically admitted to highly selective institutions.

No more than 10 percent of the first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshman class will have a combined percentile score of 139 or less.

Selective institutions:

Admit first-time, full-time degree-seeking students, and transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours, who attain a combined percentile score, resulting from the addition of their high school percentile rank and the percentile rank attained on a nationally normed test, i.e., ACT or SAT, which equals or exceeds 120 points. Students achieving a score of 24 or better on the ACT College Entrance Examination, or its equivalent on the SAT, are automatically admitted to selective institutions.

No more than 10 percent of the first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshman class will have a combined percentile score of 119 or less.

Moderately selective institutions:

Admit first-time, full-time degree-seeking students, and transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours, who attain a combined percentile score, resulting from the addition of their high school percentile rank and the percentile rank attained on a nationally normed test, i.e., ACT or SAT, which equals or exceeds 100 points. Students achieving a score of 21 or better on the ACT College Entrance Examination, or its equivalent on the SAT, are automatically admitted to moderately selective institutions.

No more than 10 percent of the first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshman class will have a combined percentile score of 99 or less.

Open-enrollment institutions:

May admit any Missouri resident with a high school diploma or its equivalent as a first-time, full-time degree-seeking freshman. Open access to a particular institution, however, does not guarantee access to selected programs which may have additional institutionally approved admission criteria. It is recognized that public two-year colleges must provide open enrollment.

Nota Bene:

Students who are admitted as exceptions to the standard admissions requirements of highly selective, selective, and moderately selective institutions should perform at levels comparable to regularly admitted students. All reports on student performance collected by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, e.g., student success rates and student graduation rates, should include separately identified aggregate data on these students as well as aggregate comparisons between regularly admitted students and students admitted as exceptions because of (a) low high school percentile class rank and/or (b) low percentile scores on the college admissions test.

4. Remediation

**(Approved by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

All Missouri colleges and universities will provide appropriate instructional and student support services. No public four-year institution which is highly selective or selective will offer formal remedial coursework.

5. Highly Qualified Teacher

**(Approved by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

All newly certified public school teachers entering the profession must be as highly qualified as possible:

90 percent of the students admitted to state-approved teacher education programs will attain an Enhanced ACT Composite Score at the 66th percentile and/or an equivalent score of 265 on the C-BASE, or above.

80 percent of the prospective secondary classroom teachers will attain a level of performance on nationally normed Major Field Achievement Tests in their content field which equals or exceeds the national average, i.e., at or above the 50th percentile.

Exit assessment score on the National Teacher Examination (NTE) for at least 90 percent of the newly certified teachers will equal or exceed the national average, i.e., at or above the 50th percentile.

B. CERTIFICATE/DEGREE PROGRAMS

1. Statewide Academic Program Inventory

On April 21, 1989 the Coordinating Board directed the staff, with the assistance of Missouri's public institutions, to develop a comprehensive program inventory that will display complete information on options and emphasis areas, that reflects standardized nomenclature and program code assignments, and that can be linked to an improved data support system that will provide information on enrollment, credit hours, degrees conferred, and instructional expenditures that will be useful in monitoring trends at the programmatic level.

2. Academic Programs Review Policies

NOTE: The board adopted clarifying comments on February 6, 2003, which follow this policy.

a. **New/Off-Site Program Review**

Policy

New/Off-Site Program Review

(1) Policies and Procedures for the Review of Academic Program Proposals: New Academic Programs, Off-site Delivery of Existing Programs and Program Changes (*Adopted by the board on April 17, 1997*) (*Included in this version are editorial changes made by the staff in consultation with chief academic officers to streamline the process without changing the policy. - October 2000*)

The Policy for the Review of Academic Program Proposals is an essential component for achieving the programmatic initiatives contained in the Coordinating Board's Blueprint for Missouri Higher Education regarding institutional mission enhancements, technical education, funding for results and a telecommunications-based delivery system.

These policies and procedures help ensure that Missouri's higher education institutions continue to offer high quality student centered programs that effectively serve the citizens of the state. The most efficient use of state resources requires that institutions maintain these high standards, collaborate whenever possible and design programs that avoid unnecessary duplication in a service region. In cooperation with institutions in both the public and independent sectors, these policies and procedures have been carefully designed to further these important goals.

The Coordinating Board discharges its responsibility primarily through data collection and the systematic review of proposals for new academic programs, off-site delivery of existing programs, and changes in existing programs. In the case of public institutions, the Coordinating Board approves or disapproves academic program proposals.

Program Review Policies for Independent Institutions

To maintain an understanding and appreciation of the contributions made by the independent sector, and consistent with the report on Coordinating Board for Higher Education and Independent Institution Relationships adopted by the CBHE in 1982, these policies also extend to independent institutions with the following exceptions:

- Flexibility in the application of these criteria is appropriate to accommodate the specialized mission of independent institutions and to acknowledge the differences between public and independent institutions as well as the different degrees of responsibility and authority the Coordinating Board and state have in the operation of the respective sectors.
- Proposals submitted by independent-sector institutions will be received and reviewed in the context of the statewide system of higher education. While the CBHE does not approve or disapprove programs at independent institutions, it may make pertinent comments as it deems appropriate.

Delegation of Authority and Communication with the Academic Community

The Coordinating Board's responsibilities for academic program review are delegated to the Commissioner of Higher Education. The status of the proposal submitted to the CBHE for review will be accessible on the CBHE web site. Upon completion of a review, action by the Commissioner will be sent directly to the institution. All actions of the Commissioner will be reported to the Coordinating Board as an information item at its next regularly scheduled meeting. Final authority for all program actions remains with the Coordinating Board.

Guiding Principles

The academic program review process must support the development of those desirable characteristics for Missouri's system of higher education that were adopted by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education in December 1992. They include:

1. Higher education and vocational-training services of the highest quality that are truly competitive on a national and international level;
2. A coordinated, balanced, and cost-effective delivery system;
3. A range of vocational, academic, and professional programs that are affordable and accessible to all citizens with the preparation and ability to benefit from the programs;
4. Differentiated institutional missions and implementation plans, both among and within sectors, designed to meet state needs and goals with a minimum of program duplication; and
5. Systematic demonstration of institutional performance and accountability through appropriate assessment efforts.

Serving Statewide Needs

The CBHE policy on the review of academic programs seeks to accomplish the following in the context of serving statewide needs:

1. To distinguish program changes that merely need to be noted for the purpose of an accurate statewide program inventory from program changes that are substantive in nature;
2. To distinguish between programs which are being initiated at a particular institution from existing programs which are targeted for delivery to new sites;
3. To increase professional peer involvement in the review of program proposals;
4. To promote a common vocabulary and definitions for program review, while encouraging common course-naming and use of CIP classification codes;
5. To address cooperative initiatives among institutions in the delivery of higher education programs; and
6. To move requests for new academic programs, off-site delivery of existing programs, and program changes through the approval/comment process in a timely manner.

Essential Characteristics of Proposals

In general, each proposal should exhibit:

1. A good fit with institutional mission, the filling of a demonstrable need, and the best use of resources in light of the contributions of existing programs and the benefits of collaborative efforts.
2. A description of:
 - a. Program structure that provides enough essential and relevant detail with which to make an evaluation;
 - b. Aspects of the program that promote program quality, including accreditation potential; and
 - c. Program characteristics and procedures, including performance goals, that will become the basis for follow-up reviews of all academic programs.
3. Information about program finances (for public institutions only) in a concise, consistent format for all proposals.

The policies and procedures on academic program review are intended to be rigorous but flexible enough to meet new challenges without excess regulation. The review process ensures a solid foundation for the design of quality academic programs.

Alignment with External Accreditation

Decisions to seek program accreditation remain with the institution. In disciplines for which there are established standards for program accreditation, CBHE program review will be informed by these standards. In instances when the institution is seeking program accreditation, self-studies and other relevant materials developed can be submitted in lieu of preparing separate supporting documentation.

Special Issues

A. Use of Consultants: On those occasions when the evaluation of a program proposal requires special expertise, the Commissioner may recommend the services of an external consultant to assist in the process. The selection of a consultant shall be agreeable to all parties, and the cost shall be the responsibility of the sponsoring institution.

B. Programs Reviewed Jointly by the CBHE and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education: An institution requesting financial reimbursement for a new program from vocational/technical funds administered by DESE must submit a proposal in the CBHE format to both agencies. In general, DESE will not consider a financial reimbursement request for a program unless it is a component of a degree or certificate program approved by the CBHE.

C. Appeals:

Public Institutions

Any of the following parties may initiate an appeal of the Commissioner's action regarding a program review:

1. The institution that submitted the original proposal;
2. Any public Missouri higher education institution that believes its interests are adversely affected by the Commissioner's decision; or
3. Any member of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

A letter of intent to appeal, signed by the chief executive officer of the institution, must be received by the Commissioner within thirty (30) days of the official notice of the Commissioner's decision. Regardless of the source of an appeal, all material related to an appeal must be shared with all parties associated with the proposed

program. New programs may not be implemented while an appeal is pending.

All materials, including a rationale for the appeal, must be submitted to the Commissioner and the relevant parties within fourteen (14) days after a letter of intent to appeal has been filed. The rationale and the responses of the Commissioner will be placed on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CBHE, provided the meeting is scheduled at least fourteen (14) days after the receipt of all materials. The CBHE may refuse to hear the appeal, may resolve the issue at that meeting, or may establish a schedule for further action. All decisions of the CBHE are final.

Independent Institutions

The Commissioner will receive appeals originating from independent institutions regarding the concerns and perspectives expressed by the Commissioner to the respective institution. The resolution of such appeals will be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Review Process for New Programs

Requests for a New Program: General Outline

Step 1. A new program proposal must be received at the CBHE by the 13th of each month. Included in the request should be a full/complete proposal (see Specific Format for a Complete Proposal below) in two forms: (a) a hard copy, with appropriate signatures on the cover page, and (b) an electronic version, sent either as an e-mail attachment (preferred) or on a diskette. Institutions submitting proposals that involve collaborations/partnerships must include letters of support from collaborators or partner institutions. Collaborative efforts involving both public- and independent-sector institutions will be treated like public institution proposals.

Step 2. An institution's request will be forwarded to the academic community by two means: First, the full proposal (minus the Financial Projections section) will be posted on the CBHE web page on the 15th of each month. Second, notice will be sent electronically to all chief academic officers.

Step 3. The academic community will have twenty (20) working days to respond to an institution's new program request by raising questions, asking for additional information, or making comments. All such questions, requests, or comments shall be in writing and directed to the "Person to contact for more information", as listed on Form NP, as well as to the CBHE Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs. Proposing institutions will have the opportunity to furnish a written response to the CBHE Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs if they choose to do so and to decide whether to withdraw or proceed with the proposal. A written response is not

needed to proceed. Record files for institutions that proceed will include all comments and responses.

Step 4. Independent institutions are not required to submit financial projections except when a proposed program involves a cooperative relationship with a public institution. Once a proposal is complete, a recommendation will be sent to the Commissioner for action. The institution will be notified of the Commissioner's action, and the action will be reported to the CBHE at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Normally, program reviews should be completed within 45 working days after being officially posted.

Specific Format Required for a Complete Proposal

A complete proposal should contain the following information in this order and numbered this way:

1. New Program Proposal Form: Please complete Form NP
2. **Need:**
 - A. Student Demand:
 - i. Estimated enrollment each year for the first five years for full-time and part-time students (Please complete **Form SE**.)
 - ii. Will enrollment be capped in the future?
 - B. Market Demand:
 - i. National, state, regional, or local assessment of labor needs for citizens with these skills
 - C. Societal Need:
 - i. General needs which are not directly related to employment
 - D. Methodology used to determine "B" and "C" above.
3. **Duplication and Collaboration:** If similar programs currently exist in Missouri, what makes the proposed program necessary and/or distinct from the others at public institutions, area vocational technical schools, and private career schools?

Does delivery of the program involve a collaborative effort with any external institution or organization? If yes, please complete **Form CL**.

4. **Program Structure:** Please complete Form PS
 - A. Total credits required for graduation
 - B. Residency requirements, if any
 - C. Courses and credits required for general education
 - D. Courses and credits required for the major
 - E. Number of free elective credits remaining (Sum of C, D, and E should equal A)
 - F. Requirements for thesis, internship, or other capstone experiences
 - G. Any unique features, for example, interdepartmental cooperation
5. **Financial Projections** (for public institutions only): Please complete **Form FP**. Additional narrative may be added as needed. If more than one institution is providing support, please complete a separate form for each institution.
6. **Program Characteristics and Performance Goals:** See the recommended format and issues to be addressed (Form PG). For collaborative programs, responsibility for program evaluation and assessment rests with the institution(s) granting the degree(s).
7. **Accreditation:** If accreditation is not a goal for this program, provide a brief rationale for your decision. If the institution is seeking program accreditation, provide any additional information that supports your program.
8. **Institutional Characteristics:** Please describe succinctly why your institution is particularly well equipped or well suited to support the proposed program.
9. Any Other Relevant Information

Review Process for Off-Site Delivery of Existing Program

As a result of technology, institutions have an increased number of alternatives for delivery of certificate and degree programs to students at remote sites. These policies and procedures refer to sites that are in Missouri, and which involve primarily synchronous delivery through the use of traveling faculty, remotely located faculty, and/or the use of two-way interactive video.

This process should be used when an institution intends to provide an opportunity for students to pursue a full degree off site in Missouri or

advertises a new offering to the general public in a fashion that implies that a full program will be offered in Missouri at a site remote from the main campus. For two-year institutions, the main campus is defined as the institution's taxing district.

Institutions that intend to offer programs in other states are expected to abide by the program approval policies of the host state.

Request For Off-Site Delivery Of Existing Program: General Outline

Step 1. A proposal for the off-site delivery of an existing program must be received at the CBHE by the 13th of each month. Included in the request should be a full/complete proposal (see Specific Format for a Complete Proposal below) in two forms: (a) a hard copy, with appropriate signatures on the cover page, and (b) an electronic version, sent either as an e-mail attachment (preferred) or on a diskette. Institutions submitting proposals that involve collaborations/partnerships must include letters of support from collaborators or partner institutions. Collaborative efforts involving both public- and independent-sector institutions will be treated like public institution proposals.

Step 2. An institution's request will be forwarded to the academic community by two means: First, the full proposal (minus the Financial Projections section) will be posted on the CBHE web page on the 15th of each month. Second, notice will be sent electronically to all chief academic officers.

Step 3. The academic community will have twenty (20) working days to respond to an institution's request for off-site delivery of an existing program by raising questions, asking for additional information, or making comments. All such questions, requests, or comments shall be in writing and directed to the "Person to contact for more information," as listed on Form OS, as well as to the CBHE Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs. Proposing institutions will have the opportunity to furnish a written response to the CBHE Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs if they choose to do so and to decide whether to withdraw or proceed with the proposal. A written response is not needed to proceed. Record files for institutions that proceed will include all comments and responses.

Step 4. Independent institutions are not required to submit financial projections except when a proposed program involves a cooperative relationship with a public institution. Once a proposal is complete, a recommendation will be sent to the Commissioner for action. The institution will be notified of the Commissioner's action, and the action will be reported to the CBHE at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Normally, program reviews should be completed within 45 working days after being officially posted.

Specific Format Required for a Complete Proposal

A complete proposal should contain the following information in this order and numbered this way:

1. Off-site Delivery Proposal Form: Please complete Form OS.
2. **Need:**
 - A. Student Demand:
 - i. Estimated enrollment each year for the first five years for full-time and part-time students (Please complete **Form SE**.)
 - ii. Will enrollment be capped in the future?
 - B. Market Demand:
 - i. National, state, regional, or local assessment of labor need for citizens with these skills
 - C. Societal Need:
 - i. General needs that are not directly related to employment
 - D. Methodology used to determine "B" and "C" above.
3. **Duplication and Collaboration:** If similar programs currently exist in Missouri, what makes the proposed program necessary and/or distinct from the others at public institutions, area vocational technical schools, and private career schools?

Does delivery of the program involve a collaborative effort with any external institution or organization? If yes, please complete **Form CL**.
4. **Financial Projections** (for public institutions only): Please complete **Form FP**. Additional narrative may be added as needed. If more than one institution is providing support, please complete a separate form for each institution.
5. **Program Characteristics and Performance Goals:** See the recommended format and issues to be addressed (**Form PG**). Please submit the Program Characteristics and Performance Goals for the program at this site as well as for those of the equivalent on-campus program. For collaborative programs, responsibility for program

evaluation and assessment rests with the institution(s) granting the degree(s).

6. Quality Assurance for Off-Site Programs:

A. General Oversight: Describe the manner in which this program will be managed. How does the management of this program fit within the institution's academic administrative structure?

B. Faculty Qualifications: How do the qualifications of faculty at this site compare with those of faculty for this program at the main campus? Please also note the comparable data regarding the proportion of course-section coverage by full-time faculty at each site.

C. Support Services: Describe how the institution will ensure that students at this site will be able to access services such as academic support, library, computing, and financial aid, as well as other administrative functions, at a level of quality comparable to that of on-campus programs.

7. Any Other Relevant Information

Web-Based Courses and Programs

On April 13, 2000, the Coordinating Board adopted the Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning and Web-Based Courses developed by the CBHE staff and the Committee on Technology and Instruction (CTI). These principles apply for asynchronous programs delivered in an Internet, website environment, through satellite transmission or via distribution of audiovisual and/or print material.

Principles of Good Practice for Distance-Learning/Web-Based Courses

When providing courses and programs through distance-learning methods, institutions should establish standards and encourage academic integrity equivalent to those expected of courses offered in a traditional, campus-based environment. These Principles of Good Practice, adapted from the 1999 Guidelines for Distance Education by the North Central Association Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA), are suggested as a guide for Missouri institutions as they develop and implement courses for, and assess their involvement in, distance education and web-based course delivery.

The intent of these principles is to encourage reflection on quality and best practices, as faculty and institutions negotiate the rapidly changing and sometimes unfamiliar territory that such courses

inherently have. Institutions are encouraged to operationalize these principles in locally directed ways that result in meaningful steps toward ensuring high quality.

I. Distance-learning courses and programs, including web-based courses, should maintain high academic integrity.

- Institutions should ensure both the rigor of courses and the quality of instruction.
- Institutions should ensure that the technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of each course.
- Institutions should ensure the currency of materials, programs, and courses.
- Each institution's distance education policies regarding ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products should be clear and in writing.
- Institutions should provide appropriate faculty support services specifically related to distance education.
- Institutions should provide appropriate technological and pedagogical training for faculty who teach distance education courses/web-based courses.
- Faculty should engage in timely and adequate interaction with students and, when appropriate, should encourage interaction among students.
- Institutions should ensure that distance-learning courses and web-based courses apply toward degrees and that there is sufficient explanation to the distance learner as to how those courses apply toward degrees.

II. Distance-learning and web-based courses and programs should be assessed and evaluated regularly.

- Institutions should assess student capability to succeed in distance education programs and should apply this information to admission and recruiting policies and decisions.
- Institutions should evaluate the educational effectiveness of their distance education programs and web-based courses (including assessments of student-learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction) to ensure comparability to campus-based programs.

- Institutions should ensure that the performance of distance-learning faculty and faculty involved in providing web-based courses is evaluated in a fashion that is at least as rigorous as that used to evaluate the performance of their peers who do not teach distance-learning courses.
- Institutions should ensure, to a reasonable extent, the integrity of student work.

III. Institutions involved in distance education and web-based instruction should ensure that students have access to adequate resources and services.

- Institutions should have access to the equipment and technical expertise required for distance education.
- Institutions should ensure that students have access to, and can effectively use, appropriate library resources (through traditional and electronic means), including MOBIUS, a consortium of Missouri's academic libraries.
- Institutions should monitor whether students make appropriate use of learning resources.
- Institutions should provide laboratories, facilities, equipment, and software appropriate to the courses or programs and/or make clear to students the responsibilities they have to provide their own such equipment.
- Institutions should provide adequate access to a range of student services appropriate to support distance-learning courses and programs, including (but not limited to) admissions, enrollment, assessment, tutorials, special needs access, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of course materials, placement, and counseling.
- Institutions should provide an adequate means for resolving student complaints.
- Institutions should provide students with information that adequately and accurately represents the programs, requirements, and services available.
- Institutions should ensure that students enrolled in courses possess the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the technology employed in the program and should provide aid to students who are experiencing difficulty using the required technology.

Review Process for Program Changes

A change in an academic program needs to be submitted to the Coordinating Board for both informational and review purposes. After considering the requested changes, the Commissioner may determine that the program change should be submitted instead as a new program proposal. Program changes should be reported using the "Request Program Change" form. Please complete Form PC. Program changes that should be submitted include the following:

Program Title Change: All revisions or changes in the name of a program or its nomenclature shall be reported to the CBHE. A title or nomenclature revision that includes substantive curriculum changes may be deemed tantamount to a new program and may be referred back to the institution for resubmission as a new program.

Combination Programs: This category includes only those programs that result from a mechanical combination of two previously existing programs. Substantive curricular changes shall ordinarily be limited to the elimination of duplicated requirements. The development of interdisciplinary programs and area-study programs that use the resources of several existing programs needs to be handled through the new program approval process.

Single-Semester Certificates: Given the limited scope of this type of program, a single-semester certificate may be added or deleted simply by using the "Request for Program Change" form. The establishment of a longer program, however, should be pursued through the "Review Process for New Programs."

One-Year Certificate Programs: A one-year certificate program developed from an approved program can be reported as a program change provided the program is directly related to an approved degree program and consists predominantly of courses included in the approved parent degree program. A one-year certificate not associated with an approved parent degree program should be submitted as a new program.

Option Addition: The addition of a specialized course of study as a component of an umbrella degree program may be submitted as an option-addition program change, subject to the limitation that the Commissioner shall make a determination regarding the potential for unnecessary or inappropriate duplication of existing programs. Only in those instances in which duplication is not a problem, may the proposed option be implemented. The following general guidelines are used to distinguish a permissible option addition from a proposed new degree program.

A. An option (or emphasis area) functions as a component of an umbrella degree program. As such, an option in a specialized topic shall consist of a core area of study in the major plus selected topical

courses in the specialty. Although typically, the core area of study shall constitute a preponderance of the requirements in the major area of study, especially at the baccalaureate level or below, as measured by the number of required courses or credit hours, no specific percentage distribution requirement has been established.

B. A proposed option (or emphasis area) shall be a logical component or extension of the umbrella degree program. One measure of this compatibility—but certainly not the only one—would be the consonance of the proposed addition with the federal CIP taxonomy. For example, in physics, while optics would be an appropriate option or emphasis area, astrophysics would ordinarily not be acceptable, since it is typically viewed as a branch of astronomy rather than physics.

C. The number of new courses required to implement a new option (or emphasis area) can also be a relevant consideration.

Inactive Status for Existing Programs: Programs placed on "Inactive Status" will essentially be suspended for a specified period not to exceed five years. Students in the program at the time this status is adopted will be permitted to conclude their course of study if they have no more than two years of coursework remaining, but no new students may be admitted to the program. Programs designated as "Inactive" will be noted on institutional program inventories. At the conclusion of the designated inactive period—not to exceed five years—the institution must review the program's status and may either delete or reactivate the program. In the event the institution chooses to reactivate the program, the institution will provide to the Coordinating Board satisfactory evidence that the resources necessary for the program are available and must establish performance goals for the program that are acceptable to the Coordinating Board.

Deletion of Programs: Institutions need to submit standard program-change information whenever a program or option is deleted. This same provision applies whenever two or more programs are to be consolidated into one or more new offerings.

FORMS referenced in the text above are not included in this document.

Clarifying Comments

(Adopted by the board February 6, 2003)

Background

Sections 173.005(1), 173.005(7), and 173.030, RSMo, assign to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) responsibilities for new academic program approval at public higher education

institutions and for the review of relevant data and information from all institutions. All public institutions are required to receive CBHE approval prior to implementing any new programs. Independent institutions are encouraged to submit new program proposals for review and comment only. Information provided by independent institutions enables the CBHE to fulfill its obligations as the state's planning agency for higher education. The CBHE's Policies and Procedures for the Review of Academic Program Proposals are located on the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) website. These policies and procedures are intended to ensure

- An orderly, timely, and equitable review process;
- Mission alignment;
- Avoidance of unnecessary duplication;
- Increased collaboration; and
- A balanced, high-quality, cost-effective system.

Rationale

The CBHE revised its policy framework on program review in 1997 to make it less regulatory. Within the CBHE's current policy framework, institutions have expanded their program offerings. Between April 1997 and June 2002, approximately four new degree/certificate programs were added by public institutions for every one deleted, and at independent institutions, approximately seven new degree/certificate programs were added for every one deleted. At a time when all of higher education is struggling to address the state's current and future financial challenges, it is essential that the justification for new program proposals be clear, concise, and compelling.

By adopting Clarifying Comments to its existing policy, the CBHE is establishing more explicit descriptions of the types of data necessary for evaluation of new academic program proposals. The CBHE and the MDHE are committed to a program review framework that continues to promote a diverse high-quality system of higher education throughout the state.

Clarifications

The moratorium for all new program actions, adopted by the CBHE at its October 2002 meeting, is removed. New academic program proposals will begin to be posted on the MDHE website beginning February 15, 2003. Institutions are expected to follow the review process and use the forms outlined in the CBHE's Policies and Procedures for the Review of Academic Program Proposals. Clarifications about the scope of the data to be submitted are

provided in the following five areas: Alignment with Institutional Mission, Demonstrable Need, Efficient Use of Resources, Benefits of Collaboration, and Expansion of Distance Learning.

Alignment with Institutional Mission

New program proposals will be evaluated within the context of outcomes and strategies outlined in an institution's strategic plan including those related to students served, program emphasis areas, centers of excellence, and admission selectivity. New academic program proposals should advance an institution's mission.

Demonstrable Need

New academic programs should help expand and sustain a quality workforce in Missouri. Although the predictable economic impact of a new program will not be used as a sole criterion, evidence relating to student and market demands, as well as how the proposed program will contribute to identified needs in the region, state or nation, should be presented. While not an exhaustive list, Missouri has identified the following fields as representing areas of need:

- Information technology
- Advanced manufacturing
- Biomedical/biotechnology or life sciences
- Teacher education (especially in the fields of science, mathematics, and special education)

Whether addressing the needs in these or other fields, institutions should provide evidence of, and a rationale for, the importance of the proposed program to Missouri's economy and educational opportunities for more Missourians. Institutions should consider both current and future needs of particular regions, the state, and the nation when identifying new programmatic areas.

Cost differentials and geographic location may become important factors in examining the extent of access provided to Missouri's citizens. When cost differentials and/or geographic location are used as part of the justification for a new program, evidence demonstrating the impact of these and other factors on enrollments, program quality, sustainability, and other related elements should be provided.

Efficient Use of Resources

In developing new programs, institutions are encouraged to design programs that will contribute to a coordinated, balanced, and cost-effective postsecondary delivery system. While some level of

duplication can be expected among institutional program inventories, the costly, unnecessary duplication of existing programs offered by Missouri institutions should be avoided. Institutions should demonstrate, through descriptions of content, structure, and other related details, not only that a proposed program is clearly different from an institution's current programs but also that there are compelling reasons for adding the program even when prospective students have access to equivalent programs at other Missouri institutions. It is acknowledged that in evaluating unnecessary duplication, several factors, including ease of access (both geographical and financial), the college-going rate in particular regions, sophistication and complexity of program offerings, and regional job demands, should be considered. In addition, the alignment of the proposed program's structure and content, the proposed degree nomenclature, and the program's CIP designation with statewide practices must be readily discernable.

For public institutions - since it is anticipated that additional state funding for new programs will not be available in the immediate future - information about program finances must be very clear. It is acknowledged that each institution's governing board is responsible for the oversight of the institution's internal resource decisions, that new programs can be designed to serve additional students at little or no cost, and, furthermore, that several sources of funds may exist to support a new program. Program deletion is not considered a necessary requirement for the addition of a new program. Within this context, the following questions should be considered:

- What are the specific sources of funds to support the new proposed program?
- If the new program is being funded through the "core institutional budget," what amount of funds will be reallocated and from which areas?
- Are there any programs that will be deleted as a result of implementing a new program?
- If the program will be supported by external funds, have the funding agency, the amount of funds, and whether they are one-time or ongoing funding been identified?

The proposing public institution should provide evidence that sufficient funds will be available to financially implement and sustain a high-quality new program without compromising the quality of existing programs.

Benefits of Collaboration

Collaboration for mutual benefits is strongly encouraged. Institutions are expected to describe whether collaborating with other institutions

is feasible. Regardless of whether collaboration is part of the proposed program, if an institution proposes to deliver a program that is already offered in the state, i.e., already exists in the official CBHE program inventory, the proposing institution should include its rationale for collaborating or for moving forward alone. The possibility of contractual and cost-sharing arrangements among institutions within and across sectors should be given consideration.

Distance-Based and Off-Site Programs

Technology continues to have a major impact on the number of alternatives open to institutions in the design and delivery of academic programs. Proposals for distance-learning programs should be in alignment with the board's Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning/Web-based Courses. In the case of proposals for off-site delivery, proposing institutions should work collaboratively by building on the inventory of available coursework within the locale and by utilizing the human resources and facilities of local providers to thereby reduce the costs associated with establishing new delivery sites.

Existing Program Review

In 1983 the Coordinating Board for Higher Education directed its staff and the state's public institutions of higher education to initiate a systematic review of academic programs. The statewide review has resulted in a two-tier process: (1) a review by each four-year public institution of approximately 20 percent of its programs over a five-year cycle; and (2) state-level reviews of selected program areas as needed. The former process has been labeled campus-based reviews to distinguish it from review efforts that involve a statewide effort for a particular set of disciplines.

1. *State Level Review*

(Adopted by the board September 10, 1983)

Criteria for State Level Instructional Program Review

The criteria for state level review are:

- Contribution of Program to Institutional Mission
- Statewide Needs
- Access
- Program Expenditures

Contribution to Institutional Mission

The extent to which a program relates directly to the institution's mission and role in the state system of higher education is particularly important in state level review. The diversity of the institutions according to mission suggests different objectives among similar kinds of programs as well as different funding needs.

An important public policy goal of the Coordinating Board is to encourage differential missions for institutions and that includes differential standards for qualitative performance. Thus, the quality criterion is combined with the contribution to mission criterion for the purposes of state level review.

Statewide Needs

In statewide planning there are two kinds of instructional needs to consider: (1) the enrollment demands of students; and, (2) the overall market demand for educated persons. The two kinds of instructional needs may at times be different; they may even be in conflict with each other. In addition, there are other needs to determine. What are the research needs of the state, and how are those needs related to instructional programs? What are the public service needs? What are the student aid needs? These cannot be considered entirely apart from instructional needs.

Access

The differences in mission and purpose between institutions should permit access to students of varying abilities, interests, and career goals. The availability of instructional programs within the state and bordering states and financial access for Missouri citizens are the major statewide access concerns. Articulation between programs and institutions is a particularly important access issue at the state level.

Program Expenditures

The Coordinating Board's responsibility to recommend state general revenue support for instruction, research, public service, student aid, and institutional support is made in light of expenditure levels, the state's needs, and institutional pricing factors. Because state level program review must be accomplished within the context of statewide needs, one necessary data element is that of expenditure analysis of programs in terms of the distinctive role of a public college or university in the state system of higher education. The efficient use of state resources requires an analysis of instructional programs in the context of their congruence with institutional mission, and productivity.

2. *Campus-Based Reviews*

(Approved by the board September 10, 1983)

For campus-based reviews institutions examine programs each year in whatever sequence that best satisfies institutional scheduling requirements. The primary foci of these reviews are to assess and strengthen programs and to establish and maintain institutional priorities. The results of these reviews are reported to the CBHE, but no attempt is made to place the results for individual programs in a statewide perspective or to draw comparisons among institutions on the relative status of programs. The following is the suggested format for summary reports submitted by institutions to the CBHE:

- Name of each degree reviewed and name of the department responsible for administering the degree;
- Program mission and the relationship of the program to established institutional priorities;
- Distinguishing characteristics of the program;
- Opportunities for improvement and extent of program vulnerability;
- Competitive advantage of the program
- Trends in student enrollment for majors and graduates and FTE faculty teaching loads of the program over the past three years;
- Sponsored research activity and public service;
- Trends in faculty support and total program expenditures; and
- Approved institutional recommendations for action as well as specific actions taken to enhance, maintain, reduce, or delete programming associated with a specific degree.

Revisions to Campus-Based Reviews of Existing Programs

(Approved by the board December 1, 1989)

The Coordinating Board directed the staff to work with institutions to examine the following issues in order to realize the full potential of the campus-based review process:

1. Strengthening the linkage between campus-based reviews and institutional decisions regarding resource allocations and viability of programs with qualitative deficiencies;

2. Enhancing the connection between the campus-based review process and both institutional assessment programs, particularly in terms of student performance in the major, and the board's new performance indicators initiative; and
3. Report to board annually.

3. *Criteria for Degree Programs*

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Degree programs (i.e., majors) offered by Missouri's public institutions shall, at a minimum, satisfy the following criteria:

- Demonstrate centrality to the sponsoring institution's mission.
- Provide objective evidence of success in addressing statewide needs and/or contributing toward the attainment of statewide goals.
- Maintain a critical mass of majors and graduate annually an average, calculated over the prior three years, of at least 10 majors at the associate or baccalaureate degree level, 5 majors at the master's degree level, and 3 majors at the doctoral degree level, unless there is sufficient justification for exceptions, particularly in the arts and sciences.
- Regularly produce highly qualified graduates as demonstrated in the following areas:
 - Performance on assessments of general education, including measures of oral and written communication skills and critical thinking
 - Performance on nationally normed tests, licensure or certification examinations, and/or other measures of achievement in the major
 - Average placement rates of those seeking employment which take into account general economic conditions
 - Alumni and employer satisfaction rates

4. *Doctoral Programs*

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Missouri public and independent doctoral degree-granting universities should strive to have graduate programs recognized nationally as being among the best in the United States, by:

- Having all students who are admitted to graduate programs for which there is a nationally normed admissions test (e.g., GRE, MAT, LSAT, etc.) submitting such scores prior to admission to Missouri's graduate programs with 66 percent of all first-time graduate students scoring above the 50th percentile on the respective examinations
- Increasing the number and proportion of doctoral degrees awarded in each program to citizens of the United States
- Having all academic divisions/departments of Missouri's public and independent colleges and universities provide their faculty with electronic access to state, national, and international education/research communication networks (e.g., MORENET, BITNET, NSFNET, and INTERNET)
- Improving computer-based linkages among all college and university libraries, enhancing access and exchange opportunities as well as expanding interactions via national and international networks
- Increasing by 50 percent, by 1996, the amount of money awarded on a competitive basis to Missouri's public research universities from both the federal government and other external sources for basic and applied research grants and contracts

3. External Course Delivery

a. **Procedures for the Delivery of Courses at External Sites**

(Adopted by the board June 12, 1997)

Definition and Applicability

These procedures apply to credit courses only, including dual credit courses, which are delivered at an external site in a real time synchronous format, i.e., the course requires the student to be in a particular location at a specified time. Independent institutions are invited to participate in these agreements.

For public community colleges, external sites include all locations outside a college's taxing district and all dual credit courses offered in high schools regardless of location. For public four-year colleges and the state's two-year technical college, external sites include all locations other than the main campus.

Guiding Principles

Public Colleges and universities should be responsive to the needs of Missouri citizens for increased access by providing credit courses to be delivered at external sites, i.e., away from the home campus.

Prospective students should be able to access information easily and in a timely manner about distance learning educational opportunities provided by Missouri's public colleges and universities.

By sharing information openly, public colleges and universities can more effectively design a public system of higher education that is balanced, cost-effective, and of high quality.

Independent institutions should be invited to participate in these agreements.

Procedures for Synchronous Course Delivery at External Sites

Both public two- and four-year institutions agree to abide by the following procedures. In addition, prior CBHE approval for course delivery by public two-year institutions at external sites as required by Section 163.191(4) RSMo will be considered to be met when the following conditions exist:

- Credit courses delivered at external sites are posted on a World Wide Web Site using a common format for the state.
- Public institutions will communicate openly with other public institutions when plans to deliver a course at an external site are at a location that has traditionally been defined in the service region of another public institution.
- Institutions will openly share information with regional consortia as appropriate.
- Institutions will resolve any differences regarding the appropriateness of course delivery at external sites.

Conflict Resolution

Public Institutions agree to involve their respective chief academic officers in an attempt to resolve any emerging conflicts over synchronous course delivery at external sites. For situations in which agreements can not be reached between two institutions, a

four-person committee of chief academic officers with equal representation from each sector will be appointed to work with the institutions to resolve any disagreements. Each group of chief academic officers, i.e., two- and four-year, will appoint their representatives to this committee on a case by case basis.

Conflicts, which are not resolved at the institutional level, will be sent to the CBHE for resolution.

Reporting Requirements

Institutions are responsible for keeping accurate records about credit courses delivered at external sites. Regular reports about credit course delivered at external sites will not be required; if questions arise, however, or should the board decide to initiate a study about credit courses delivered at external sites, institutions should be prepared to demonstrate that they are following these procedures and should have available information about the magnitude and scope of courses delivered at external sites, e.g., number of course completers and number of credit hours generated.

Clarifying Comments to Programs and Courses Delivered at External Sites

(Approved by the board February 8, 2001)

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopted the following clarifying comments to its Procedures for the Delivery of Courses at External Sites:

- Decisions to establish, to delivery programs and courses at, and to fund external sites must be made within the parameters of state law;
- Institutions interested in delivering academic programs and related courses at a site away from the home campus are expected to work through existing regional consortia to prevent unnecessary duplication by sharing resources. Unresolved conflicts among institutions should be brought to the CBHE for coordination and resolution;
- Public funds used by colleges and universities include state appropriations, tuition revenues from individuals and from state and federal aid, and local taxes;
- Missouri's system of higher education, including a healthy independent sector, contributes significantly to the diversity and choice provided to Missouri citizens. Public and independent institutions should explore cooperative ventures that are consistent with their missions, including contracting for services, as a way of increasing educational opportunities;

- Public institutions planning to provide local service at a distance are expected to work collaboratively with existing local partners by building on currently available general education and occupation-related coursework and by utilizing the human resources and facilities of local providers, including area vocational technical schools; and
- Section 173.005.2(3), RSMo, requires CBHE approval for the establishment of a separate external site by a public institution away from its home campus. To be approved for a branch campus, extended campus, or other form of external-site development, public institutions must demonstrate a need for service that is not unnecessarily duplicative.

Plus-Two Programs for Public-Private Institutions

(Approved by the board February 28, 1992)

In reviewing the Central Methodist College and Mineral Area College cooperative plus two programs the Coordinating Board for Higher Education established the following criteria for the approval of such programs:

- They should build upon the public/private cooperative model;
- They should be cost-effective; and
- They should not involve unnecessary duplication at the expense of the state.

Public Policy Guidelines on Lower Division Coursework, Lower Division Certificate, and Associate Degree Delivery

(Approved by the board December 4, 2003)

Introduction

1.1 Missouri has a complex, diverse system of postsecondary public, independent and proprietary institutions that offer a rich array of instructional courses and programs in support of undergraduate certificate and degree programs. Undergraduate educational opportunities are provided on campuses throughout the state, off-campus and outside of community college taxing districts, and through distance learning utilizing advanced technologies.

1.2 Institutions across all sectors are committed to providing easy access to high quality undergraduate certificate and degree programs that are responsive to the state's needs for a highly-trained workforce and an educated citizenry. Missouri's public institutions are also committed to an efficient higher education system without unnecessary duplication of programs and courses funded by the state

and to ensure that all Missouri citizens have access to affordable undergraduate education and training opportunities.

Statutory Responsibility

2.1 According to Section 173.020 (2), (3) and (4) RSMo, the CBHE has responsibility for identifying higher education needs in the state; developing arrangements for more effective and economical specialization in types of education programs offered and students served, and for more effective coordination and mutual support among institutions in the utilization of facilities, faculty and other resources; and designing a coordinated plan for higher education in the state. The CBHE performs this responsibility through working with presidents/chancellors and chief academic officers in developing accountable, efficient and fair program delivery policies.

Program and Degree-Level Responsibility

3.1 The three primary postsecondary sectors responsible for undergraduate course and program delivery are the public, independent, and proprietary sectors.

A description of the responsibility of each sector in program delivery follows:

- **Public Sector Institutions.** Two-year public institutions and open-enrollment public four-year institutions with an historic mission of providing career and technical programs have responsibility for delivery of lower-division one- and two-year certificate programs and associate degrees. In addition, all public four-year institutions have responsibility for delivery of baccalaureate-level programs.
- **Independent Sector Institutions.** Independent institutions contribute significantly to the diversity and choice of educational programs provided to Missouri citizens. Independent two- and four-year colleges and universities deliver an array of undergraduate courses and programs consistent with their missions.
- **Proprietary Sector Institutions.*** Proprietary institutions contribute significantly to the postsecondary education and training opportunities provided to Missouri citizens. Proprietary schools range from single program schools that offer short-term certificates to accredited degree-granting institutions offering a range of courses and programs at multiple educational levels. These institutions are responsible for delivering educational programs consistent with the standards established by the CBHE.

*The policy guidelines do not change the current working relationship of the CBHE and the DHE to independent and proprietary institutions.

Duplication of Effort

4.1 Missouri's colleges and universities are committed to mission focus as a way of promoting programmatic excellence in order to meet targeted demographic and employment needs of the state's employers. Working collaboratively, the CBHE and the state's postsecondary education institutions strive to have a balanced and well-coordinated system composed of separate institutions each with its own governing structure.

4.2 By its very nature, however, Missouri's postsecondary education system (similar to postsecondary systems in other states) involves necessary duplication. An overlapping core of certificate and degree programs is offered on many campuses to provide Missouri citizens with easy access to postsecondary educational and training opportunities in close proximity to their home and/or work locations. Another desirable aspect of this overlap includes the existence of programs in similar subject areas delivered by alternate means or in different formats in order to meet the needs of students and employers.

4.3 The overlap among institutions in lower-division coursework is extensive because of lower-division course requirements that students must complete to receive undergraduate certificates and degrees. Furthermore, a full complement of lower-division general education coursework is offered by Missouri's public and independent institutions, and some of Missouri's proprietary institutions, thereby complicating the assignment of a particular public sector or set of public institutions as the primary points of access to higher education in the state. Some investments (at both the two- and four-year institutions) have been made to expand access to lower-division coursework and programs, including the offering of lower-division dual credit courses at high schools throughout the state, which creates additional overlap of function across sectors. Developmental courses are also offered by two- and four-year institutions due to the various needs of students and the practicality of delivering such courses.

Demand

5.1 There is an increased demand for education and training at all postsecondary levels, including lower-division one- and two-year certificates and associate degree programs as well as for non-degree workforce development. Increasingly, some amount of postsecondary education is required to be successful in most jobs. Similarly, Missouri's economy is affected by the number of its citizens who complete some postsecondary education. To have an

effective, well-articulated certificate and associate degree-delivery system, Missouri's institutions need a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities associated with lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degrees.

Policy Framework

6.1 For public institutions, the board's policy framework on lower-division certificates and associate degree programs has relied on a regulatory environment, especially concerning the development of new degree programs and the offering of courses and programs off-campus or outside community college taxing districts. In relation to independent and proprietary institutions, the CBHE has encouraged cooperation and collaboration to evolve a streamlined, efficient, quality higher education system.

6.2 Despite steps to deregulate Missouri's public policy environment concerning lower-division coursework and delivery of lower-division certificate and associate degree programs, Missouri's framework has resulted in multiple providers, which creates the potential for reduced efficiency through an unnecessary duplication of effort.

6.3 In some geographic areas, postsecondary institutions are located in close proximity, while in others, communities and their residents are far from the taxing district boundaries of a community college, the home site of another two-year institution, or a four-year campus. The complexity of Missouri's educational system suggests that one approach to meeting state needs for cost-effective, high quality, lower-division certificates and associate degree programs will not fit all situations. Improving access and improved educational attainment for Missouri citizens will require multiple approaches, built upon mutual trust and a spirit of collaboration.

Guiding Principles

7.1 The state's postsecondary education system should be responsive to the needs of Missouri citizens for increased access to lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degree programs.

7.2 Regional planning involving business and community leaders, educational providers across all postsecondary sectors, and policymakers should be utilized to ensure responsiveness to state needs and a minimum of unnecessary duplication in course and program offerings.

7.3 Community colleges involved in regional planning should continue to utilize community college service regions as a useful tool.

7.4 Institutional aspirations should be designed within the context of statewide needs and priorities for a thriving economy supported by high quality, affordable education and training programs.

7.5 The best delivery models, including ones that involve collaborative ventures and effective utilization of instructional technology, should be identified to promote increased access to and success in lower-division coursework, and certificate and associate degree programs.

7.6 Eligibility for developing new lower-division certificate and associate degree program proposals at public institutions should be described clearly and concisely as should the process for resolving differences about lower-division course delivery at locations other than the main campus of the institution.

7.7 To the extent possible, local decision-making should be utilized to resolve differences among institutions rather than superimposing solutions developed by external groups.

7.8 Institutional differences should be addressed quickly based on an agreed-upon process to resolve conflicts between and among institutions.

7.9 Institutions should engage in regular and systematic review of all lower-division certificate and associate degree programs to ensure faculty engagement in department-based structured conversations about educational quality processes that focus on good practice and spur improvement including consolidation, expansion, or deletion of courses and/or programs.

Certificate and Associate Degrees

8.1 Public two-year institutions should be the primary providers of lower-division certificates and associate degrees offered by public colleges and universities throughout the state, including those involving web-based delivery.

8.2 Public, open-admissions institutions that have an historic mission of providing career and technical education at the lower-division certificate and associate degree level may continue to offer previously approved lower-division certificates and associate degrees, unless otherwise limited or restricted by statute.

8.3 Previously approved lower-division certificates and associate degrees offered by public institutions that are not open-admissions institutions should be continued only if student demand and employer needs warrant continuation, unless otherwise restricted by statute.

8.4 Public institutions that are not open-admission institutions are encouraged to phase out associate degrees over a five-year period, with the assumption that two-year institutions or open-admissions four-year institutions will assume responsibility for existing programs that continue to have demand and/or meet state needs.

8.5 New lower-division certificates and associate degree program proposals for delivery by public institutions must undergo review and approval by the Commissioner of Higher Education prior to implementation following the guidelines established by the CBHE for academic program review and clarifying comments.

8.6 Development and delivery of web-based lower-division coursework, lower-division certificates, and associate degree programs should be aligned with the CBHE Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning/Web-Based Courses.

8.7 As outlined in the CBHE policy for New Program Approval, new proposals for lower-division certificates and associate degrees for delivery by public institutions must demonstrate: alignment with mission; demonstrable need (including evidence of, and a rationale for, the importance of the proposed program to Missouri's economy and educational opportunities for more Missourians); efficient use of resources; and a rationale for collaborating or for moving forward alone.

8.8 Proposals for new lower-division certificates and associate degrees from public colleges and universities should be developed in consultation and collaboration with educational providers and business leaders in a particular service region.

8.9 Public two-year institutions should be the lower-division certificate or degree-granting institution for any new lower-division certificates or associate degrees to be offered by public institutions with the following stipulations:

Public two-year institutions proposing to provide lower-division certificates or associate degrees outside a taxing district are expected to work collaboratively with public four-year institutions by building on currently available general education and occupation-related coursework, and by utilizing the human resources and facilities of public four-year institutions. Public four-year institutions, as well as other education providers, are expected to collaborate in good faith with the proposing public two-year institution.

If a public two-year institution is unable to meet the demands for new lower-division certificates or associate degrees, public four-year institutions may be approved to offer new lower-division certificates or associate degrees.

8.10 New lower-division certificates and associate degree program proposals for delivery by independent institutions should undergo review by the Commissioner of Higher Education with an opportunity for comment prior to implementation.

8.11 New lower-division certificates and associate degree programs proposals for delivery by proprietary schools must meet statutory and Department of Higher Education minimum standards for programs offered at these institutions.

Lower-Division Coursework

9.1 Public institutions agree to communicate openly with other public institutions about plans to deliver lower-division coursework at a location other than the main campus.

9.2 Generally, for courses offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus, public two-year institutions will be the primary providers of lower-division coursework with the following stipulations:

Within the taxing district of a community college, the community college will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.

Within the county in which a public four-year institution is located, the public four-year institution will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.

In cases where the public four-year institution cannot or chooses not to meet the needs of the county in which it is located for accessible lower-division coursework, public two-year institutions, where appropriate, may offer such coursework.

Within the county in which the state's public technical college is located, the state's public technical college will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.

Within the county in which a public two-year branch campus of a public four-year institution is located, the public two-year branch campus will be the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution at a location other than the main campus.

In situations when there is overlap between the taxing district of a community college and the county in which a public four-year college or university, the state's technical college, or a two-year branch campus of a public institution is located, the affected

institutions agree to collaborate in determining the institution best suited to deliver lower-division coursework offered by a public institution.

For new coursework delivered in geographic areas outside both community college taxing districts and the counties in which public four-year institutions, the state's technical college, or the branch campus of a public four-year institution are located, the primary provider of lower-division coursework offered by a public institution should be the institution best suited by mission, proximity, cost effectiveness, and/or expertise to meet the needs of the service area and to demonstrate value-added student learning.

In situations in which there is a perceived unmet need for accessible lower-division coursework not met by the public institution(s) delegated primary responsibility for lower-division coursework, other public institutions may deliver coursework in such locations, with the understanding that they notify the local institution(s) and agree to work collaboratively in determining the best ways for public higher education to respond to unmet needs.

9.3 Training and workforce development offered for lower-division credit at off-campus locations will be subject to the conditions set forth in Section 9.2 (a-f).

9.4 All dual credit courses offered in high schools by colleges and universities are considered lower-division coursework. Public sector providers of dual credit courses at all locations and those independent/proprietary institutions choosing to abide by statewide guidelines associated with dual credit course delivery will be those institutions best suited by proximity to ensure that the CBHE guidelines for oversight of quality delivery are followed, including that college or university faculty provide oversight for course comparability; that college or university faculty mentor, observe, and evaluate high school teachers; that high school teachers participate in college orientation and professional development activities; and that college or university faculty review student work and provide oversight for assessment of student outcomes.

Existing Program Review

(It should be noted that the CBHE policy concerning existing program review is currently being revised to include all programs at public institutions and to be aligned with quality principles and institutional authority for local decision-making.)

10.1 Institutions should move towards using/adopting quality principles as a management tool and systematically evaluate the appropriateness of all lower-division certificates and associate degrees on a regular schedule.

10.2 The review of existing lower-division certificates and associate degrees should be aligned with the revision of campus-based reviews that will emphasize quality processes and academic audits and will deemphasize regulation.

10.3 Institutions should establish standards and processes to use in evaluating lower-division certificates and associate degrees, including the extent to which these programs help meet the state's workforce development needs.

10.4 State data collection obligations on existing programs should be kept to a minimum. Duplicative data collection efforts should be integrated into a single process serving multiple functions.

10.5 Oversight for existing program review provided by the CBHE will emphasize audits of quality processes, will serve to demonstrate accountability to external constituents, and should also be used by institutions as a catalyst for continuous improvement.

Existing Commitments

11.1 Existing off-campus sites that have CBHE approval or substantial investment in facilities may continue to operate.

11.2 Existing relationships between colleges and universities and high schools that have been effective in providing quality dual credit courses to high school students may be maintained.

11.3 All lower-division certificate and associate degree programs, regardless of prior approval or commitments, should engage in regular and systematic review.

Conflict Resolution

12.1 Presidents/chancellors of public institutions agree to communicate in a direct, concise, and timely manner about any disagreements associated with the implementation of these policy guidelines.

12.2 Any disagreements between and among public institutions will be resolved quickly at a local level whenever possible.

12.3 Presidents/chancellors of public institutions agree to engage educators from non-involved institutions to facilitate resolution for any conflicts that remain unresolved after two months of good faith efforts at resolution on the local level. The educators identified will be part of a facilitation team that works with the affected parties in an attempt to resolve any conflicts.

12.4 The facilitation team will gather information about the unresolved conflict(s) and hold a meeting with the

presidents/chancellors and chief academic officers of the institutions involved in a disagreement(s) in an attempt to facilitate resolution of the conflict.

12.5 Each of the affected public institutions in an unresolved conflict also has the option to request formal mediation. If formal mediation is pursued, all affected institutions agree to share in the expenses associated with retaining a mediator.

12.6 If the conflict remains unresolved two weeks after the facilitation team meeting and/or the use of a formal mediator, each public institution agrees to submit in writing a summary of the unresolved conflict to the Commissioner of Higher Education.

12.7 The Commissioner of Higher Education will determine a resolution and communicate it to all of the involved parties within one month after receiving written notification of an unresolved conflict.

12.8 Affected parties have one month after receipt of the Commission of Higher Education's resolution to send a written appeal of the Commissioner's decision to the CBHE.

12.9 The CBHE will hold a public hearing on all appeals no later than its next regularly scheduled board meeting. Decisions of the CBHE shall be communicated in writing to all affected parties. Decisions of the CBHE shall be binding on all affected parties.

Glossary

Associate Degree: An earned academic degree with the term "associate" in the title and normally requiring at least 60 semester credit hours or equivalent at the lower-division level.

CBHE: The Coordinating Board for Higher Education, established by Section 173.005.2, RSMo 1986.

Commissioner of Higher Education: Head of the Department of Higher Education and appointed by the CBHE.

Community College Taxing District: A community taxing district is a local district in which the community calls for a local election at which the registered voters decide the question of taxing themselves to establish a community college in their area of the state. Community college taxing districts are local political subdivisions with local control and governance over the services being provided.

Community College Service Regions: Agreed-upon regional boundaries throughout Missouri in which one community college is assigned per region.

Degree: An award conferred upon an individual by a college, university, or other postsecondary education institution as official recognition for the successful completion of a postsecondary educational program or course of study.

Developmental Courses: A set of instructional activities designed to ensure adequate preparation for access to collegiate-level work for students with deficiencies. These courses generally do not satisfy requirements for a formal certificate or degree.

Dual Credit: Collegiate-level courses taught in high schools to high school students who receive, simultaneously, both high school and college-level course credit.

General Education Coursework: A prescribed course of study, as defined by institutional faculty and validated by the institution's administration or governing board, distinct from a program major, required of all graduates, and intended to ensure that all graduates possess a common core of collegiate-level skills and knowledge.

Independent Sector Institution: A postsecondary educational institution controlled by a private individual(s) or by a nongovernmental agency, usually supported primarily by other than public funds, and operated by other than publicly elected or appointed officials.

Lower-Division Certificate: A formal award conferred upon an individual by a college, university, or other postsecondary education institution as official recognition for the successful completion of a postsecondary educational program or course of study. The program or course of study consists of non-remedial courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with freshman or sophomore students and is offered primarily by two-year institutions.

Lower-Division Coursework: Courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with freshman and sophomore students and offered by both two- and four-year institutions.

Off-Campus Site: All locations other than the main campus. For public community colleges, off-campus sites include all locations outside a community college's taxing district and all dual credit courses offered in high schools regardless of location. For public four-year colleges, the state's two-year technical college, and any branch campuses of four-year institutions, off-campus sites include all locations other than the main campus.

Primary Provider: A public postsecondary institution with the principal responsibility for addressing the instructional/programmatic needs of citizens in a community or region.

Program Review: The process by which the academic department (or program) evaluates its strengths and weaknesses through a self study and presents results, a plan for improvement, and writes a report for its own future use and/or use by external stakeholders monitoring the process.

Proprietary Sector Institution: A privately controlled education institution certified to operate by the CBHE pursuant to Sections 173.600 through 173.619, RSMo, and accredited by an accrediting commission recognized by the United States Department of Education that provides a postsecondary course of instruction leading to a certificate or degree.

Public Sector Institution: A postsecondary educational institution established by statute or the Missouri Constitution whose programs and activities are operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials, and which is partially supported by public funds.

Training and Workforce Development Programs: Instructional programs designed to improve specific skills, knowledge, and competencies of individuals who are already in the workforce and/or those preparing to enter the workforce.

C. TRANSFER/ARTICULATION ISSUES

1. Credit Transfer Guidelines

**(Adopted by the board June 8, 2000;
revised October 13, 2005)**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) fosters a public policy framework that is committed to the values of access, quality, and efficiency for the state's higher education system. As Missouri continues to increase aspiration and performance levels for all students, it will require an educational system that is responsive to the needs of students for easy mobility across institutions. Missouri's commitment to have institutions with distinctive missions, including differential admission standards, underscores the importance of an effective transfer and articulation system. These credit transfer guidelines are intended to ensure that high school graduates with clear educational objectives may complete a degree program offered by colleges and universities in the shortest possible time, whether the student remains in one institution or transfers to another.

The CBHE recognizes that each Missouri college and university is responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of expectations for all students completing its courses, programs, certificates, or degrees. It also recognizes that for effective and

efficient transfer of credits between and among these colleges and universities, it is necessary to exercise this responsibility within the context of a statewide "system" of higher education. Effective transfer and articulation is based upon inter- and intra-institutional communication, a mutual respect for institutional integrity, a high degree of flexibility, procedures for identifying problems, a mechanism for implementing appropriate solutions, regular and systematic review of policies, and a timely and orderly process for change. Harmonious and equitable consideration of any problem that a student may encounter in moving from one institution to another is an ultimate objective of these transfer guidelines.

A. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITY

Section 173.005(6), RSMo, requires the CBHE to "establish guidelines to promote and facilitate the transfer of students between institutions of higher education within the state." This responsibility is discharged through the implementation of the CBHE's credit transfer policy.

B. APPLICABILITY OF GUIDELINES

These transfer guidelines are applicable to course credits and related matters for undergraduate students who wish to transfer between Missouri public colleges and universities that have regional accreditation or that have been advanced to candidacy status by the North Central Association. The CBHE also recommends these guidelines to Missouri independent institutions that meet the same accreditation standards. In addition, the development of program-to-program articulation agreements is encouraged between Missouri's public and/or independent institutions of higher education and postsecondary institutions, such as proprietary institutions, with national accreditation recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and certification by the CBHE.

C. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Neither transfer nor native students should be advantaged or disadvantaged as a consequence of the transfer process.

The delivery of lower-division courses should not be the sole province of a single institution, but should be subject to articulation between sending and receiving institutions.

Separate credit-hour limitations should not be imposed on transfer students based on the type of sending institution.

Variations in baccalaureate degree programs that reflect institutional missions should be respected and accommodated.

The faculty role in the design of curricula and the establishment of degree requirements must be respected.

Program-to-program institutionally articulated degrees for the associate of science (AS) and associate of applied science (AAS) should be encouraged.

A workable transfer system requires predictability of transfer decisions and responsiveness to student needs. Demonstrating the effectiveness of transfer and articulation systems, including institutional and statewide agreements, requires analyses that employ common data elements and definitions that are collected and shared among institutions and with the CBHE.

Prior to full implementation, any curricular changes that affect existing transfer and articulation agreements should involve timely mutual consultation by both receiving and sending institutions and notification to all affected parties once new agreements are reached.

Presidents and chancellors should ensure that effective transfer and articulation are a priority at their institutions and that all members of the academic community--including faculty and department chairpersons--must honor all transfer agreements agreed to by their institutions.

In order to facilitate student success and to reinforce the respective missions of associate and baccalaureate institutions, students who begin an associate degree program and who aspire to pursue a baccalaureate degree should be encouraged by both the sending and receiving institutions to complete the associate degree program, to transfer immediately upon associate degree completion, and to complete the baccalaureate degree in a timely manner.

II. STATEWIDE GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY

The state has high expectations for all Missouri college graduates and has promulgated a statewide general education policy that establishes a rationale for general education; defines the responsibilities of institutions, faculties, and students for general education; and promotes broad curricular goals and student competencies that should result from institutional general education programs.

A. RATIONALE FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

General education is the curricular foundation of the American academy. It encourages students to acquire and use the intellectual tools, knowledge, and creative capabilities necessary to study the world as it is, as it has been understood, and as it might be imagined. It also furnishes them with skills that enable them to deepen that understanding and to communicate it to others. Through general

education, the academy equips students for success in their specialized areas of study and for fulfilled lives as educated persons, as active citizens, and as effective contributors to their own prosperity and to the general welfare.

As the academy's knowledge of the world is structured, so must general education be constructed to introduce students to the traditional disciplines of the arts and sciences. As that knowledge is ever changing, so must general education alert students to connections between the traditional disciplines and to the potential for interaction among all branches of knowing, ordering, and imagining the real world. As the real world is diverse, so must general education inform students that the world is understood in different ways and provide them with the means to come to terms, intelligently and humanely, with that diversity. As diversities of knowing and understanding must be made open and accessible, so students must acquire appropriate investigative, interpretative, and communicative competencies.

B. RESPONSIBILITIES

While the academy is not the only place where these high aims can be imagined and achieved, more than any other place it receives public and private support for just these ends. General education is thus a core responsibility of the academy as well as a foundation curriculum for students.

To discharge this trust, academic institutions must deliver appropriate resources to their faculties, and faculties must design and transmit to students effective means and persuasive rationales for achieving general education aims. Both institutions and faculties must satisfy their constituents that these ends are being achieved satisfactorily and in ways that are consistent with each institution's mission.

While students have a right to expect their academic institutions and faculties to fulfill these responsibilities, students also incur the obligation to act as partners in learning in order to become agents in, not merely receivers of, their own general education.

In the state of Missouri, all public institutions of higher education and each independent or proprietary institution that is signatory to the statewide credit transfer policy must agree that the general education achievements of students who succeed in discharging their obligations are wholly transferable in terms both of graduation credit and of real competencies.

C. TRANSFERABILITY OF GENERAL EDUCATION CREDIT

In order to facilitate the transfer of students among institutions of higher education in the state, the CBHE has supported the development of a statewide general education policy that is intended to ensure the portability of general education credit among Missouri's colleges and universities.

Each institution of higher education in Missouri fosters a program of general education. General education programs vary from institution to institution as each represents a statement reflective of the institution's ethos and mission. General education programs are developed by the faculty and validated by the institution's administration and governing board. Each institution expresses, through its general education program, the high expectations for the academic skills and knowledge that all students who complete degrees offered by that institution should master.

Consistent with its mission, each public institution of higher education in Missouri and each independent or proprietary signatory to this policy shall offer a general education program that is designed to enable students to achieve the following general education goals. In order to ensure transferability of general education credit among these institutions, each shall specify and publish a 42 semester-hour block of general education credit that will be considered equivalent to corresponding blocks of credit at other public and signatory institutions in enabling students to achieve these general education goals.

D. GENERAL EDUCATION GOALS AND COMPETENCIES

Two terms describe the aims of general education in the state of Missouri, *goals* and *competencies*. The term *goals* refers to the curricular intent of state policy regarding the academic skills and knowledge content of general education. The term *competencies* denotes illustrative state-level expectations for student performance in general education. Faculty at each institution design a general education program that fits the ethos and mission of each institution and meets state-level curricular goals. Each general education program must also specify institution-level student competencies that will follow from achieving these curricular goals and which are in alignment with the suggested competencies listed in the following sections. These general education aims and outcomes may be achieved in various ways, including through traditional courses, through interdisciplinary teaching, or through competencies embedded across the curriculum. State-level curricular goals and institution-level student competencies for general education fall into two categories: academic skills and knowledge.

1. Skills Areas

a. Communicating

State-Level Goal: To develop students' effective use of the English language and quantitative and other symbolic systems essential to their success in school and in the world. Students should be able to read and listen critically and to write and speak with thoughtfulness, clarity, coherence, and persuasiveness.

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Analyze and evaluate their own and others' speaking and writing. conceive of writing as a recursive process that involves many strategies, including generating material, evaluating sources when used, drafting, revising, and editing.
- Make formal written and oral presentations employing correct diction, syntax, usage, grammar, and mechanics.
- Focus on a purpose (e.g., explaining, problem solving, argument) and vary approaches to writing and speaking based on that purpose.
- Respond to the needs of different venues and audiences and choose words for appropriateness and effect.
- Communicate effectively in groups by listening, reflecting, and responding appropriately and in context.
- Use mathematical and statistical models, standard quantitative symbols, and various graphical tactics to present information with clarity, accuracy, and precision.

b. Higher-Order Thinking

State-Level Goal: To develop students' ability to distinguish among opinions, facts, and inferences; to identify underlying or implicit assumptions; to make informed judgments; and to solve problems by applying evaluative standards.

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Recognize the problematic elements of presentations of information and argument and to formulate diagnostic questions for resolving issues and solving problems.
- Use linguistic, mathematical or other symbolic approaches to describe problems, identify alternative solutions, and make reasoned choices among those solutions.

- Analyze and synthesize information from a variety of sources and apply the results to resolving complex situations and problems.
- Defend conclusions using relevant evidence and reasoned argument.
- Reflect on and evaluate their critical-thinking processes.

c. Managing Information

State-Level Goal: To develop students' abilities to locate, organize, store, retrieve, evaluate, synthesize, and annotate information from print, electronic, and other sources in preparation for solving problems and making informed decisions.

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Access and/or generate information from a variety of sources, including the most contemporary technological information services.
- Evaluate information for its currency, usefulness, truthfulness, and accuracy.
- Organize, store, and retrieve information efficiently.
- Reorganize information for an intended purpose, such as research projects.
- Present information clearly and concisely, using traditional and contemporary technologies.

d. Valuing

State-Level Goal: To develop students' abilities to understand the moral and ethical values of a diverse society and to understand that many courses of action are guided by value judgments about the way things ought to be. Students should be able to make informed decisions through identifying personal values and the values of others and through understanding how such values develop. They should be able to analyze the ethical implications of choices made on the basis of these values.

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Compare and contrast historical and cultural ethical perspectives and belief systems.
- Utilize cultural, behavioral, and historical knowledge to clarify and articulate a personal value system.

- Recognize the ramifications of one's value decisions on self and others.
- Recognize conflicts within and between value systems and recognize and analyze ethical issues as they arise in a variety of contexts.
- Consider multiple perspectives, recognize biases, deal with ambiguity, and take a reasonable position.

2. Knowledge Areas

a. Social and Behavioral Sciences

State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of themselves and the world around them through study of content and the processes used by historians and social and behavioral scientists to discover, describe, explain, and predict human behavior and social systems. Students must understand the diversities and complexities of the cultural and social world, past and present, and come to an informed sense of self and others. (Students must fulfill the state statute requirements for the United States and Missouri constitutions.)

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Explain social institutions, structures, and processes across a range of historical periods and cultures.
- Develop and communicate hypothetical explanations for individual human behavior within the large-scale historical and social context.
- Draw on history and the social sciences to evaluate contemporary problems.
- Describe and analytically compare social, cultural, and historical settings and processes other than one's own.
- Articulate the interconnectedness of people and places around the globe.
- Describe and explain the constitutions of the United States and Missouri.

b. Humanities and Fine Arts

State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of the ways in which humans have addressed their condition through imaginative work in the humanities and fine arts; to deepen their understanding of how that imaginative process is informed and limited by social,

cultural, linguistic, and historical circumstances; and to appreciate the world of the creative imagination as a form of knowledge.

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Describe the scope and variety of works in the humanities and fine arts (e.g., fine and performing arts, literature, speculative thought).
- Explain the historical, cultural, and social contexts of the humanities and fine arts.
- Identify the aesthetic standards used to make critical judgments in various artistic fields.
- Develop a plausible understanding of the differences and relationships between formal and popular culture.
- Articulate a response based upon aesthetic standards to observance of works in the humanities and fine arts.

c. Mathematics

State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of fundamental mathematical concepts and their applications. Students should develop a level of quantitative literacy that would enable them to make decisions and solve problems and which could serve as a basis for continued learning. (The mathematics requirement for general education should have the same prerequisite(s) and level of rigor as college algebra.)

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Describe contributions to society from the discipline of mathematics.
- Recognize and use connections within mathematics and between mathematics and other disciplines.
- Read, interpret, analyze, and synthesize quantitative data (e.g., graphs, tables, statistics, survey data) and make reasoned estimates.
- Formulate and use generalizations based upon pattern recognition.
- Apply and use mathematical models (e.g., algebraic, geometric, statistical) to solve problems.

d. Life and Physical Sciences

State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of the principles and laboratory procedures of life and physical sciences and to cultivate their abilities to apply the empirical methods of scientific inquiry. Students should understand how scientific discovery changes theoretical views of the world, informs our imaginations, and shapes human history. Students should also understand that science is shaped by historical and social contexts.

Suggested Competencies: Students will demonstrate the ability to...

- Explain how to use the scientific method and how to develop and test hypotheses in order to draw defensible conclusions.
- Evaluate scientific evidence and argument.
- Describe the basic principles of the physical universe.
- Describe concepts of the nature, organization, and evolution of living systems.
- Explain how human choices affect the earth and living systems.

E. STRUCTURE OF GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULA

The statewide general education policy requires institutions to design and offer a general education program that includes a minimum of 42 semester-hours of credit distributed across the academic skills and knowledge areas of the previous sections. These credit hours should be distributed in such a way that students who complete the 42 semester-hour block of general education credit from any institution of higher education in the state will have had the opportunity to achieve the high expectations embodied in the state-level goals and suggested competencies set forth in the previous section.

All Missouri public institutions of higher education and each independent or proprietary signatory institution have the privilege and responsibility to exercise their academic and institutional autonomy to design and promulgate a general education program that supports their respective institutional mission and assists students to meet these high expectations. Institutional programs may be designed in various ways to achieve these state-level goals and institution-level competencies, and the role of institutional faculty in designing institutional general education curricula and establishing general education requirements for their degrees will be respected.

Each institution will document how the design of its 42 semester-hour block of general education credit meets the state-level curricular goals and ensures that its students achieve institution-level

competencies that are aligned with these goals. Each institution will also document how it implements this design, how it assesses and certifies student skills and knowledge, and how it uses assessment results to improve its general education program.

Institutions may design and promulgate general education programs that exceed the expectations of the 42 semester-hour block of credit. In this case, institutions may require transfer students to complete general education and other institutional requirements in addition to the 42 semester-hour block of credit only when these additional requirements are also required of native students. Students assume full responsibility for meeting specified degree and/or major requirements, specifically those related to course prerequisites.

Each public and signatory institution will define a 42 semester-hour general education block of credit that achieves state-level curricular goals. All of these 42 semester-hour blocks of general education credit will be considered equivalent for transfer purposes. Typically, these blocks will be composed primarily of lower-division courses and requirements. However, institutions may define their 42 semester-hour blocks of general education credit as being composed of both lower- and upper-division courses and requirements. In such cases, receiving institutions must accept, as equivalent, other institutions' blocks of general education credit—even when these are composed solely of lower-division courses.

Baccalaureate professional schools or programs may specify exceptions to the credit-hour minimum established in this section by promulgating these exceptions and by establishing specialized articulation programs related to AS and AAS degrees, as detailed in the following sections. Transfer students completing AS and AAS degrees from institutions that do not have program-to-program institutionally articulated agreements are not exempt from satisfying the requirements of departments or divisions of the institution into which the student transfers.

F. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW AND NOTIFICATION PROCESS

The purpose of the review and notification process for general education programs is to ensure that all public institutions and each independent or proprietary signatory institution have general education programs in place that meet the statewide policy. This review process is intended to be collegial, professional, and helpful to institutions in developing general education programs that meet policy guidelines. The program review and notification process is intended to focus on strengthening general education, to be reflective of the state's commitment to institutional autonomy, and to be protective of each student's right to the fair application of this statewide credit transfer policy.

Initial Review and Approval.

All Missouri public institutions of higher education and each independent or proprietary institution that is signatory to the statewide credit transfer policy will develop and post, both on the MDHE web site and their own institution's web site, a curricular design and an assessment plan indicating how that institution plans to implement and assess general education. The institution's program will remain on the MDHE web site for a period to be determined by the CBHE's Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA).

All public and signatory institutions will be invited to comment on each institution's plan through the designated transfer and articulation officer. The institution whose program has been posted for comments will be responsible for forwarding comments to the CBHE for posting, evaluating the feedback, responding to the commenting institution, and determining which suggestions it will incorporate into its curriculum design. When an institution is ready to implement its program, the president will notify COTA. Once COTA acknowledges receipt of the notice, that institution is then eligible to certify its students for transfer under the statewide general education policy standards. The institution has the further responsibility to post its general education program on its web site and to maintain its currency and accuracy. COTA will notify all public and signatory institutions when an institution is eligible to certify students for transfer.

Any concerns that individual institutions have about another's general education program will be handled via the Appeals Process that is part of this credit transfer policy.

Ongoing Dialogue and State-Level Policy Review.

The annual statewide transfer and articulation conference will be used as a vehicle to encourage communication and collaboration about institutional approaches to general education. Sessions will be scheduled to discuss concerns about the state credit transfer policy and to promote good practices in general education teaching, transfer, and assessment.

III. TRANSFER

A. TRANSFER DEGREES

Transfer degrees are prescribed lower-division programs that are designed to facilitate the transfer of students into a four-year baccalaureate degree program upon completion of a lower-division program at another institution of higher education. Associate degrees, especially the associate of arts (AA) degree, are the most common lower-division transfer degrees.

Determination of course requirements of the major for a baccalaureate degree, including introductory and related courses, is the prerogative of the baccalaureate degree-granting institution. The catalog of each four-year institution will state clearly the requirements for each baccalaureate degree program. When specific prerequisites are required, they will be designated and noted in conjunction with the course description. Transfer students who have completed prerequisites will not be required to duplicate study in the area. The catalog will specify any restrictions or additional requirements for each major.

Addendum:

Institutional policies that distinguish between upper- and lower-division courses vary among baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. The variation results in similar courses being identified as upper or lower division at different institutions. This can create redundancy in the curriculum of a transfer student (i.e., repeating an upper division course at the receiving institution when the student had completed a course with the same content and learning objectives but labeled as lower division by the sending institution). Receiving institutions should avoid duplication of learning and effort by transfer students by requiring the completion of a related but non-duplicative upper-division course that would enrich the curriculum of the student. The analysis of possible duplication of learning and effort in identification of upper- and lower-division courses is best addressed in the context of articulation agreements between sending and receiving institutions.

A baccalaureate degree program, or major, consists of a general education program and a coherent grouping of courses or subject-area requirements in a specific discipline or program field. Generally, the number of credit hours required for a major ranges from thirty (30) to forty-eight (48) semester credit hours. There may be exceptions to this rule in the case of highly specialized professions or disciplines, interdisciplinary studies, or majors in general liberal arts studies.

1. Statewide Transfer Associate of Arts Degree

The associate of arts (AA) degree is designed as the statewide general studies transfer degree. This degree is structured for entry into the general range of baccalaureate degree programs offered by four-year colleges or universities. Students completing the AA degree will have completed a general education program that is consistent with the statewide general education policy, consisting of a minimum of 42 semester-hours of credit. Courses taken as part of an AA degree outside the general education program should be carefully chosen to ensure applicability to the baccalaureate graduation requirements for the program of study which the student

intends to pursue at a four-year college or university. Consequently, the transfer student has the responsibility to become familiar with the specific major and graduation requirements of the four-year institution to which transfer is intended. Institutions are also encouraged to develop articulation agreements to ensure the transfer of credit outside of the 42 semester-hour general education block of credit.

A student's AA degree curriculum may include introductory courses and other courses that permit the student to explore areas of specialization that can be pursued at a later time at the upper-division level. For AA students who continue in a particular field, the courses should be adequate in content to be counted fully toward the baccalaureate degree.

2. Program-to-Program Institutionally Articulated Degrees

This policy encourages both two-year and four-year institutions to develop voluntary, supplemental articulation agreements for the AS and AAS degrees in addition to the AA state transfer degree. These agreements will facilitate transfer and consider all factors surrounding a student's achieved program competencies, successes, and professional career aspirations.

a. Associate of Science Degree

An associate of science (AS) degree is a specialized transfer degree that is intended for students interested in transferring into professional programs that have a greater emphasis on science and math. This is an articulated degree program that results from careful planning and agreement between institutions. These programs will be developed by consultation between sending and receiving institutions on a program-by-program basis. This process may involve changes in general education requirements. Students completing articulated AS degrees will be accepted as having completed lower-division general education and prerequisite courses equivalent to the lower-division general education requirements completed by native students in the same degree program over a similar time period.

b. Associate of Applied Science Degree

An associate of applied science (AAS) degree is oriented toward career and professional preparation. The primary purpose of this associate degree is to prepare a student for entry into a particular occupation. While the AAS degree has not historically been intended as a transfer degree into a baccalaureate program, Missouri's initiatives to develop and expand its workforce development and training system demand that education and training career paths extend beyond the associate degree. When used for transfer, this degree requires careful planning and agreement between institutions on a program-by-program basis. This process may involve changes

in general education requirements. In order for students to be adequately prepared for the workforce and to facilitate articulation agreements, a minimum of twenty-five percent of the AAS degree requirements shall consist of college-level transferable general education. The AAS transfer student should be able to pursue upper-division advanced coursework in appropriate baccalaureate degree programs. (These may include the same degree area or related degree areas.) Institutions are encouraged to explore opportunities for multiple articulation agreements.

c. Other Associate Degrees

All other associate degrees not addressed by either the statewide transfer AA degree or program-to-program institutionally articulated AS or AAS degrees will be evaluated on a course-by-course basis until such time that an articulated agreement exists.

B. TRANSFER WITHOUT A DEGREE

1. General Education Curricula

Students at both two- and four-year institutions of higher education should be encouraged to pursue and complete coherent programs of study, including associate and baccalaureate degree programs and coherent general education programs. The statewide general education policy is designed to assist students to transfer a block of 42 semester-hours of general education credit by ensuring that all institutions of higher education in the state have comparable expectations regarding what students know and can do as a result of completing these blocks of general education credit and by ensuring that all public and signatory institutions define and publish 42 semester-hour blocks of general education credit that will be considered equivalent for the purposes of transfer.

All Missouri public institutions of higher education and independent or proprietary institutions that are signatory to this statewide credit transfer policy shall recognize the validity of other institutions' general education programs. Once an institution of higher education in Missouri has defined and published its 42 semester-hour block of general education credit and has notified COTA that its general education program meets the statewide general education policy's requirements, the integrity of its general education program and block of credit will be recognized by the other institutions of higher education in Missouri.

Students who are certified by their sending institutions as having completed a 42 semester-hour block of general education credit will not be required to complete any additional general education requirements that are part of the corresponding general education block of the institutions to which the students transfer. Students assume full responsibility for meeting the specified degree and/or

major requirements, specifically those related to prerequisites. General education and other institutional requirements in addition to the 42 semester-hour block of credit may be required of transfer students by receiving institutions only when native students are obligated to satisfy the same requirements.

2. Transfer Prior to Degree or General Education Program Completion

Students enrolled in associate degree programs should be encouraged to complete their degrees. Students pursuing AA degrees should be encouraged to complete a 42 semester-hour general education block of credit that meets statewide general education policy prior to transfer. Students who transfer before completing either an AA degree or a 42 semester-hour general education block of credit will have their transcripts evaluated by receiving institutions. Both receiving and sending institutions are encouraged to maintain articulation agreements to assist students and institutions in evaluating student academic accomplishments consistently and accurately.

3. Role of Sending Institutions

Sending institutions have the responsibility to certify and document on student transcripts that students have completed associate degree programs. Similarly, sending institutions have the responsibility to certify and document on student transcripts that students have completed a 42 semester-hour general education block of credit that is consistent with statewide general education policy and is considered equivalent for the purposes of transfer with other institutions' 42 semester-hour general education blocks.

Further, sending institutions should encourage students to complete coherent programs of study. They should collaborate with receiving institutions to develop articulation agreements and share information with each other and with students that assist students in transferring from one institution to the other without loss of credit.

4. Role of Receiving Institutions

Receiving institutions have the responsibility to attempt to match students' academic accomplishments with the requirements of the degrees to which the students aspire. Specifically, receiving institutions are obligated to accept completion of a 42 semester-hour general education block of credit at any public institution or any independent or proprietary signatory institution as equivalent to, and as completing, the receiving institution's 42 semester-hour general education block of credit. Receiving institutions may only impose additional general education or other institutional requirements when these are also required of native students.

Further, receiving institutions should encourage students to complete coherent programs of study. They should collaborate with sending institutions to develop articulation agreements and share information, with each other and with students, that assists students in transferring from one institution to the other without loss of credit.

(Clarifying Comment: Once a student completes an associate degree and completes the 42-hour general education core, all lower division requirements for general education is deemed to be complete. Any additional lower division requirements must be considered distinct degree requirements or prerequisites for upper division courses in the major. These lower division courses should not add to the total number of hours required for graduation unless stipulated differently for the purposes of program accreditation.)

C. TRANSFER OF LOWER-DIVISION CREDIT HOURS BEYOND THE ASSOCIATE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The number of hours required for baccalaureate-level graduation of transfer students that meet the guidelines in this document should be equivalent to the number of hours required of native students (assuming all lower-division prerequisites for courses in the student's baccalaureate program have been met). Transfer students must meet the minimum residency, upper-division course, and graduation requirements established by the baccalaureate institution. Students with AA degrees will typically transfer sixty-four (64) credit hours, which is approximately the first two years of the baccalaureate educational experience. Lower-division credit hours completed beyond the AA degree will be evaluated for transfer on a course-by-course basis. Within the constraints of these minimal requirements, and assuming program-to-program articulation for these additional hours, AA, AS, and AAS transfer students may choose to complete additional lower-division requirements at two-year institutions to meet the lower-division prerequisites and/or lower-division graduation requirements established by the baccalaureate institution.

(Clarifying Comment: Students may transfer more than 64 credit hours for lower division courses from either Missouri associate degree-granting or baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. Any additional lower division course credits above 64 credit hours will be accepted in transfer if the credits are applicable to the baccalaureate degree or are prerequisites for an upper division course in the major.)

D. OTHER TRANSFER-RELATED MATTERS

1. Junior-Level Status

While students completing associate degree programs have traditionally been accepted at the junior level by receiving institutions, it is important to note that baccalaureate programs vary in the number of hours required for graduation. In addition, all students are subject to prerequisite-course requirements, residency and upper-division credit-hour requirements, a minimum grade point average--both cumulative and in the major--and, in some instances, upper-division general education requirements. At some baccalaureate institutions, this collection of requirements varies by college and/or major. Consequently, while junior level has meaning in the context of having completed the first two years of higher education, it may be misleading to assume that completion of a baccalaureate degree can be accomplished in four years. Transfer students who have completed the AA degree from a signatory institution that is in compliance with this policy shall be received as having completed the statewide 42 semester-hour general education block of credit.

2. Curriculum Changes

All parties agree to be consultative when proposing curriculum changes that are likely to impact existing transfer and articulation agreements. The integrity of articulated degree programs requires agreements about process and procedure on implementing changes to existing agreements. Changes affecting either the statewide AA transfer degree or a program-to-program institutionally articulated AS or AAS degree should be made after appropriate consultation and with enough lead - time to provide an orderly and timely change in the nature of these articulated agreements. In instances of concern by any institution involved in this statewide credit transfer policy or in program-to-program institutionally articulated degrees, the affected institution may initiate an appeal, as provided in the Appeals Process section of this policy.

3. Admission of Transfer Students

a. Institutional Admission

The core of any orderly transfer process is the mutual acceptance of the nature and purpose of the statewide transfer AA degree and the program-by-program institutionally articulated AS and AAS degrees. If any institution of higher education finds it necessary to be selective in its admission of qualified transfer students, its criteria for admission of transfer students must be consistent with its mission and shall be stated in its official publications. Such publications shall be on file with the CBHE. Students transferring with the AA statewide transfer degree or the AS or AAS program-by-program

institutionally articulated degree, must meet the published admission requirements of the receiving institution for transfer study by students with these degrees. Transfer of the AA degree shall be predicated upon the following minimum statewide expectations:

- Completion of a minimum of 60 semester hours of college-level work oriented toward a baccalaureate degree
- Completion of an institutionally approved general education program, as defined in Section A of this document
- Achievement of a cumulative grade point average of not less than 2.0 (A=4.0, B=3.0, C=2.0, D=1.0, F=0.0), provided that only the final grade received in courses repeated by the student shall be used in computing this average

Students who earn an AA degree meeting these minimum statewide criteria, as validated by a regionally accredited associate degree-granting institution, are eligible for admission to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution (subject to the provisions outlined in this section), but not necessarily to a particular baccalaureate degree program major. Prospective transfer students should consult the catalogs of receiving institutions to determine specialized programmatic admission requirements, if any, for particular degree programs. The enrollment status of transfer students with the AS or AAS program-by-program institutionally articulated degree shall be defined as part of each transfer agreement.

b. Program Admission

Transfer students will be admitted to programs based on the same criteria as those established for the native students of the receiving institution. Admission to a specific baccalaureate degree program may result in a different computation of the grade point average (GPA). The number of hours and junior-level standing will be evaluated in accordance with the Transfer of Lower-Division Credit Hours Beyond the Associate Degree Requirements section.

4. Catalog

Transfer students shall be subject to the same regulations regarding applicability of catalog requirements as native students. This implies that transfer students may choose the operative catalog of the receiving institution at point of initial enrollment at the sending institution, assuming they meet all the conditions required of native students, e.g., continuous enrollment. Conditions that restrict a student's options, e.g., non-continuous enrollment, changes of major, or admission to program, should be invoked only if they are also applied to native students.

5. Change in Major

When students initiate changes in their stated major or degree objectives, those students assume full responsibility for meeting the specified new degree and/or major requirements. In particular, students who have earned an AS or AAS program-by-program institutionally articulated degree and who change majors or who change the institution they plan to attend should anticipate potentially significant changes in baccalaureate degree program-completion requirements. All students, regardless of the associate degree in which they are enrolled, who plan to transfer into a different field of study have the responsibility to seek pre-transfer counsel from the sending or receiving institution regarding required courses in the program which they plan to pursue and the evaluation of credits already earned as the credits apply to the particular baccalaureate program to be pursued.

6. Transfer of Grades

The academic record at a given institution will include all courses attempted. Grades of "D" or better earned in college-level work at institutions of higher education to which the transfer articulation agreement applies shall be transferred as full credit to another college or university; however, the receiving institution will treat all grades on courses attempted on the same basis as that of the native student. For example, if a native student is required to repeat a "D" grade in a specified course, a transfer student will also be required to repeat the "D" grade in the same course.

7. Credit by Examination, Dual Credit, Experiential Learning, and Pass/Fail Credit

Pass/fail credit will be transferred and treated by the receiving institution in the same way pass/fail credit is treated for native students. Advanced placement, credit by examination, dual credit, and credit for experiential learning will be transcribed and clearly defined. Course equivalency for credit by examination may be listed as desired. The receiving institution shall transfer and treat credit earned through advanced placement, credit by examination, dual credit, and credit for experiential learning in the same manner as it would for native students, except that the integrity of the associate degree or the 42-hour general education block will not be invalidated.

The policies for awarding credit by examination and nontraditional learning vary from one institution to another. Each institution will publish information about its policies for awarding credit by nontraditional modes, including the names of tests that are used to assess credit, cut-off scores, deadline dates for submission of scores to the receiving institution, and restrictions on the time interval

permitted to receive current credit for a course taken some years previously.

8. State Certification or Statutory Requirements

In the process of earning a degree, students must complete requirements for that degree and, sometimes, as in the case of teacher education, dental hygiene, allied health, or engineering programs, they must also meet state certification requirements. If certification or statutory requirements change and additional requirements become effective during the time a student is enrolled in a program, the new requirements take precedence over previously existing degree or certification standards.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF CREDIT TRANSFER POLICY AND COMPLIANCE

A. COMMITTEE ON TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

The CBHE has established a Committee on Transfer and Articulation, consisting of eight members, with responsibility to oversee the implementation of the guidelines as set forth in this policy statement.

The Committee on Transfer and Articulation will be composed of eight members appointed by the Commissioner of Higher Education, one of which shall serve as chairperson of the committee. Members shall consist of three representatives from public two-year colleges; three representatives from the public four-year colleges and universities, one of which must be from the University of Missouri and one of which must be from the other public four-year institutions; one representative from independent two-year colleges or two-year proprietary institutions; and one representative from independent four-year colleges and universities. In addition, the Commissioner, or a designated representative, will sit as an *ex-officio* voting member of the committee. The Committee on Transfer and Articulation is encouraged to seek the counsel of faculty and other institutional representatives in the performance of its functions. Those functions shall include the following:

Conducting a bi-annual review of the provisions of the college transfer guidelines and recommending such revisions as are needed to promote the success and general well-being of the transfer student;

Reviewing and making recommendations concerning transfer issues brought before it by institutions;

Recommending modifications of institutional policies and procedures that, in the committee's judgment, would enhance and facilitate the transfer of students;

Studying nontraditional credits and developing transfer guidelines for them;

Systematically soliciting suggestions and data from administrators, faculty, and students concerning matters of transfer;

Developing a job description for an articulation officer's position that defines duties and is an acknowledgement of common expectations among the institutions;

Maintaining an annually updated list of institutional articulation officers who have been appointed by the president or CEO of each institution;

Reviewing and making recommendations for change concerning the CBHE brochure, "Transfer Guidelines: Students' Rights and Responsibilities";

Monitoring both the sending and receiving institutions to determine whether they are informing transfer students of their rights and responsibilities;

Reviewing and recommending resolution of individual cases of appeal from institutions and/or students per Section B.

Preparing and submitting to the CBHE, for such action and distribution as the CBHE deems appropriate, an annual report of committee meetings, as well as actions and recommendations, including a report of student and institutional appeals cases. The chairperson must convene the committee at least once a year; and

Establishing committee rules of procedure and meeting, on the call of the chairperson, as is necessary to perform its functions.

B. APPEALS PROCESS

Each receiving institution of higher education shall have an internal process of appeal available to transfer students for purposes of challenging institutional decisions on the acceptance of the students' credits toward graduation at the receiving institution. Since receiving institutions may vary in the nature of the appeals procedures, all receiving institutions must publish in their respective catalogs or student handbooks a statement of each student's right to appeal and the procedures that should be followed. Furthermore, all incoming transfer students should receive a copy of the institution's most recent statement on rights of appeal and procedures. Responses to a student's appeal should proceed in a timely manner.

Each transfer student who believes that there has been unfair treatment must give the receiving institution an opportunity to resolve potential conflicts through the formal internal appeals

procedures of the campus. The student, however, is also encouraged to involve, at any point, the articulation officer of the sending institution in reviewing the situation and giving advice on the merits of an appeal. Upon completion of at least one level of appeal at the receiving institution, the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) or designated officer of the sending institution may choose to initiate an appeal to the CAO or designated officer of the receiving institution on behalf of the student.

Appeals involving institutions as advocates for students shall be resolved in a timely manner. Written decisions should normally be issued within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of a petition for an institution-to-institution appeal. In cases of urgency, the presidents/chancellors of both institutions will exercise good faith attempts to resolve the issue within five (5) working days. If the issue is not resolved to the satisfaction of all parties, a further appeal may be made to the CBHE Committee on Transfer and Articulation. When either a receiving or sending institution believes that a transfer practice, procedure, requirement, or policy is not in accord with the principles or spirit of the CBHE Transfer and Articulation Guide, that institution may initiate an appeal in writing to the receiving institution's articulation officer, with a copy to the CEO. If the appeal is not resolved to the satisfaction of the appealing institution, it may then appeal to the CBHE Committee on Transfer and Articulation. Appeal to the CBHE Committee on Transfer and Articulation shall be by the following procedures.

Appeal(s) to the Committee on Transfer and Articulation may be initiated by the affected student or institution only after all other remedies have been exhausted without resolution of the issue at the sending or the receiving institution. The appeals process is initiated when the CBHE Committee on Transfer and Articulation receives a written appeal.

The committee chairperson shall promptly notify the CAOs of the relevant institutions of higher education of the appeal and invite the institution(s) to submit documentation for the decision being appealed. Documentation shall normally be submitted by the relevant institutions within fifteen (15) calendar days of notification by the committee.

The chairperson of the committee shall convene the Committee on Transfer and Articulation within thirty (30) calendar days, if possible, but in no event later than ninety (90) calendar days, of the receipt of an appeal for the purpose of considering the information presented by the student and the institutions. All parties involved in the appeal shall be notified of the committee's meeting time and location. All parties involved in the appeal will have the opportunity to make an oral presentation to the appeals committee if any desires to do so.

In the event an appeal is filed involving a campus represented on the Committee on Transfer and Articulation, the Commissioner shall, for the purpose of considering the appeal, appoint an interim member of the committee from the same sector.

The committee's consideration of the appeal shall include, but shall not be limited to, the compliance of the institution(s) with the guidelines set forth in this policy, the student's compliance with the guidelines set forth in this policy, and the student's rights and responsibilities statement.

The committee chairperson shall inform the CAOs of the relevant institutions and the student, when involved, of the committee's determination and shall recommend that the CAO of the institution(s) implement the committee's recommendation.

The CAOs of the institutions shall inform the chairperson of the appeals committee within thirty (30) calendar days of the action taken in regard to the committee's recommendation.

The committee's recommendation and the action taken by the institutions shall be reported to the CBHE by the Commissioner of Higher Education.

V. DEFINITIONS

A. Articulation: The process whereby postsecondary institutions seek to foster the smooth transfer of students by developing agreements which specify in advance the terms, conditions, and expectations which shall be applied to transfer students. Supplemental to general transfer policies and guidelines, articulation agreements apply to specific courses and/or to specific degree programs. When these courses and/or degree programs are completed successfully at the sending institution, they will, for admitted students, be accepted in transfer and apply to graduation requirements for a specified degree program at the receiving institution.

B. Associate Degree: An earned academic degree with the term "associate" in the title and normally requiring at least 60 semester credit hours or equivalent at the lower-division level.

C. Baccalaureate Degree Program: The major required for the awarding of a bachelor's degree.

D. Bachelor's Degree or Baccalaureate Degree: Any earned academic degree with the term "bachelor" in the title and normally requiring at least 120 semester credit hours of study.

E. CBHE: The Coordinating Board for Higher Education, established by Section 173.005.2, RSMo 1986.

F. Commissioner: The Commissioner of Higher Education, as appointed by the CBHE.

G. Continuous Enrollment: Half time enrollment or 15 credit hours per calendar year.

H. Degree or Certificate: An award or title conferred upon an individual by a college, university, or other postsecondary education institution as official recognition for the successful completion of a program or course of study.

I. General Education Program: A prescribed course of study, as defined by institutional faculty and validated by the institution's administration or governing board, distinct from a program major, required of all graduates, and intended to ensure that all graduates possess a common core of college-level skills and knowledge.

J. Guidelines: The expected course of action or set of circumstances that apply to decision-making in which transfer of credit is involved.

K. Institution of Higher Education: As used in the context of these guidelines, "institution of higher education" means an educational institution, under either public or private control, which provides a postsecondary course of instruction of at least six months in length, leading to, or directly creditable toward, a degree or certificate and which has regional accreditation or has been advanced to candidacy status by the North Central Association.

L. Junior Standing: Generally, the term indicating satisfactory completion of approximately half of the credit-hour requirements for completion of a bachelor's degree, completion of lower-division general education requirements, and achievement of an institutionally established minimum grade point average (GPA).

M. Lower-Division Courses: Courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with freshman and sophomore students and offered during the first two years of a four-year baccalaureate program.

N. Major: A prescribed course of study that constitutes an area of specialization leading to a recognized certificate or degree.

O. Native Student: A student whose initial college enrollment was at an institution of higher education and who has not transferred to another institution since that initial enrollment and who has taken no more than 11 hours at another institution of higher education.

P. Proprietary Institution: A privately controlled education institution certified to operate by the CBHE pursuant to Sections 173.600 through 173.619, RSMo, and accredited by an accrediting

commission recognized by the United States Department of Education that provides a postsecondary course of instruction leading to a certificate or degree.

Q. Receiving Institution: The institution of higher education at which a transfer student currently desires to enroll and to have previously earned credit applied toward a degree program.

R. Semester Credit Hour: A permanently transcribed instructional activity in which one semester credit hour shall consist of a minimum of seven hundred fifty (750) minutes (for example, 15 weeks x 50 minutes per week) of classroom experiences such as lecture, discussion, or similar instructional approaches, or a minimum of one thousand five hundred (1,500) minutes of such experiences as laboratory, studio, or equivalent experiences. Both of the above are exclusive of registration and final examination time. Greater amounts of practicum or internship instruction are normally required to be the equivalent of one credit hour. In vocational education laboratories, more clock hours per credit hour are usually required.

S. Sending Institution: The institution of higher education of most recent previous enrollment by a transfer student at which transferable academic credit was earned.

T. Signatory Institution: Any independent or proprietary institution in Missouri that has signed and agreed to adhere to this credit transfer policy.

U. Transfer: The process whereby a student with previous postsecondary educational experience gains admission to another postsecondary institution and seeks to have the credits successfully earned at the previous institution(s) apply toward graduation requirements for a specific course of study at the receiving institution.

V. Transfer Student: A student entering an institution for the first time with academic credit earned at another institution, which is applicable for credit at the institution the student is entering.

W. Upper-Division Courses: Courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with junior and senior students and offered during the last two years of a four-year baccalaureate degree program.

2. Principles of Good Practice

Adopted by the board June 11, 1998

I. All policies and procedures relating to transfer and articulation should be easily understood, readily available, and widely distributed among students, faculty, and staff.

- The CBHE should adopt and maintain a clear and concise Credit Transfer Policy in consultation with institutional presidents and chancellors, who shall assure the institution's commitment to the implementation of the written accords.
- A well-functioning system of transfer and articulation depends upon meaningful collaboration as educational partners between sending and receiving institutions in the development of agreements. This collaboration should include the exchange of pertinent information, such as catalogs, course syllabi, course outlines, learning outcomes, and/or curriculum guides in an open and timely fashion.
- Transfer and articulation agreements may apply to whole programs or to a course-by-course arrangement. To the extent possible, institutions are encouraged to address transfer, articulation, and course-equivalency issues, as well as program or degree requirements, on the basis of learning outcomes or competencies.
- Transfer and articulation agreements between institutions will bear institutional identification and will be signed and dated by the institutional/system chief executive officer. Such agreements shall specify any provisions relating to time limits on the duration of the agreement or arrangements for periodic review.
- Articulation agreements must include information on how to obtain copies of the agreement. Institutions are responsible to provide additional copies of articulation agreements, either through hard copy or via electronic distribution.

II. The transfer process should be efficient, predictable, and sensitive to student needs.

- Interpretation and application of transfer and articulation agreements should emphasize the importance of a student-centered approach by all institutions.
- Each institution's articulation officer has the responsibility to facilitate all correspondence concerning transfer and articulation. All correspondence should normally be acknowledged within five (5) working days after receipt of a request.
- On occasion, good-faith efforts require institutions to make prompt decisions so students can continue to pursue their educational objectives.
- Institutions should develop agreements with any institution from which it receives a substantial number of students in transfer. The institution may first wish to seek accords with those institutions sending the largest numbers of transfer students and

then to work with those institutions generating less transfer activity.

- As the amount of time for degree completion varies based upon personal circumstances, student aspirations, and academic requirements, transfer articulation agreements should specify if there are any time limits for degree completion for students after initial entry into the program.
- Once developed and agreed to by institutions, existing transfer and articulation agreements are binding on all parties until they are formally modified through an appropriate, consultative process.

III. The transfer process should treat both native and transfer students equitably.

- The catalog of record of each institution forms the basis of any transfer and articulation agreement. Transfer students shall be subject to the same regulations regarding applicability of catalog requirements as are native students and shall be expected to complete comparable requirements consistent with the CBHE's Credit Transfer policies.
- Every student, either native or transfer, must, upon entering an institution, meet all institutional requirements to continue as a "student in good standing." An institution's requirements to maintain the status of "student in good standing" may vary in such things as continuous enrollment, change of major, or admission to programs.
- In the event that an articulation agreement is modified during a student's enrollment period and that student has met appropriate enrollment and performance expectations, graduation should be permitted under the program articulation agreement designated by the student.

IV. The faculty role in developing and maintaining curricula must be respected; revisions to existing articulation agreements should occur in a timely fashion, using consultative and collegial processes.

- In the process of developing transfer and articulation agreements, faculty within the respective disciplines must be involved in consultative and collegial processes as early as possible. Furthermore, when establishing new agreements and/or revising existing agreements, institutions must exchange information essential for informed timely decision-making by the faculty from both sending and receiving institutions.

- Colleges and universities are seeking constantly to improve the curriculum to benefit the student; therefore, orderly review, revision, and renewal in consultation with partner institutions are to be expected with such a "learning" process.
- Early disclosure of anticipated course or program changes which could lead to revisions of transfer and articulation agreements is essential in order to facilitate consultation among all parties affected by the anticipated changes. Disclosure of possible changes must be in written form and must be addressed to the articulation officer of all sending or receiving institutions that may be affected by the anticipated change.

V. Transfer and articulation agreements should reinforce the respective missions of associate and baccalaureate institutions.

- Sending and receiving institutions will maintain a written rationale for the designation of courses as upper- and/or lower-division and will provide detailed explanations when requested.
- Each institution participating in the CBHE's transfer and articulation agreement will clearly publicize and widely disseminate its course-numbering system. Distinctive numbering ranges should be identified for remedial courses and freshman-, sophomore-, junior-, and senior-level courses. A high level of commonality in course-numbering procedures will be sought to facilitate the interpretation of transcripts.

VI. The transfer process should provide for the resolution of any disagreements regarding the application or interpretation of articulation agreements or practices as expeditiously as possible, and the resolution should avoid placing an undue burden on students.

- Institutions should make good-faith efforts to resolve disagreements, when possible, at the department or discipline level.
- Issues unresolvable at the institutional level that are related to the renewal or revision of existing articulation agreements as defined in the CBHE Credit Transfer Policy or to the application of these agreements should follow the Coordinating Board's prescribed appeals process.
- Either sending or receiving institutions may request a review at the institutional level of an institution's transfer policy or, if that approach is not successful, may initiate a state-level appeal for review by the CBHE Committee on Transfer and Articulation. Such reviews may be undertaken on behalf of a particular student or may be initiated directly by an institution without the

involvement of a student, as provided by the CBHE's prescribed appeals process.

3. Increasing Transfers to Four-Year Schools

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

The number of students successfully transferring from Missouri's two-year institutions and completing a baccalaureate degree at one of the state's public or independent four-year institutions will at least double the comparable rate of transfers for academic year 1990-91.

4. Site Survey Policy

The Coordinating Board encourages all institutions operating off-campus/out-of-district residence centers throughout the state to pursue collaborative efforts in instructional delivery, and mandates that these sites be operated within the parameters of state statutes and regulations.

Should the department become aware of any of the following conditions regarding instructional delivery at these sites:

- An institution requests MDHE to assist in the mediation of a dispute between one or more institutions;
- Tensions in an area reach a critical mass resulting in potentially detrimental effects on the delivery of student services;
- There is evidence of excessive duplication of services when multiple off-campus/out-of-district higher education sites exist within the same community; or
- Institutions engage in excessive competition with each other resulting in less than efficient use of state funds.

Institutions involved in conflicts meeting these conditions may be directed by the Commissioner to respond to a standard annual report on the operation and support of all higher education centers within the affected region. This annual report should be submitted to the CBHE/MDHE by November 1 of each year, until such time the board determines to sunset this requirement. The standard report should minimally include the following data elements:

- Analysis of need
- Information on faculty and staff
- Budget and expenditures

- Tuition and fee funds
- Enrollments
- Program/course offerings
- Student retention and completion
- Available services (counseling, financial aid, advisement) and placement information

Institutions involved in conflicts meeting these conditions are strongly encouraged to continue to provide coordinated oversight with respect to ongoing joint programs and to continue to seek future collaborative opportunities.

D. CONSUMER INFORMATION

(Promulgation authorized by the board October 11, 2007)

6 CSR 10-9.010 Rules for the Posting of Consumer Information.

(1) Definitions.

(A) The term “course” shall mean any regularly scheduled instructional activity:

1. For which, upon successful completion thereof, enrolled students are given credit that can be applied to meet the requirements for achieving a degree, certificate, or similar academic award; or
2. That provides remedial instruction to students enrolled in the institution;
3. But need not include thesis or dissertation supervision; independent study; directed study or reading courses; internship supervision; individual lessons, mentoring, or supervised experiences; or any other similar activity with such a low number of enrolled students as to allow respondents to be personally identified.

(B) The term “course information” shall include a schedule listing all courses that will be offered during an academic term, all sections of each course, the name(s) of the faculty member(s) who will teach each class, and the time and location at which each course will be offered.

(C) The term “credentials” shall include the highest post-secondary degree or certificate earned by the faculty member and the faculty member’s rank (e.g., full professor, teaching assistant).

(D) The terms “faculty” and “faculty member” shall refer to each person assigned full or partial responsibility for delivery of academic course(s) at a Missouri public higher education institution and includes but is not limited to the following categories: adjunct, part-time, and full-time instructors and lecturers; and graduate students and graduate assistants who teach all or part of any course. The terms “faculty” and “faculty member” shall not include guest speakers, tutors, and practicum or internship supervisors.

- (E) The term “feasible” shall mean capable of being performed.
- (F) The terms “instructor ratings by students” and “ratings” shall mean certain evaluative information, as designated by each institution, collected at least annually, provided by students enrolled in a course about the performance of the faculty member(s) responsible for delivery of all or part of the course. Ratings posted on an institution’s website need not include all information collected in regularly conducted evaluations of faculty by students and may consist of information gathered specifically for publication on the institution’s website.
- (G) The term “post” shall mean to publish on an institution’s website.
- (H) The terms “public higher education institution” and “institution” shall mean an educational institution as defined in section 173.205.2 or 173.205.3, RSMo.
- (I) The term “section” shall mean:
1. In cases where more than one course with the same prefix, course number, and course title are offered, each distinct offering in which students may enroll; and/or
 2. Each separate subdivision within one course in which students break into groups in a formal manner to discuss and/or practice course content.
- (2) Each institution shall post each of the following on a portion of its website that is available to the general public without a login, student ID, user ID, or other password, except that no institution shall be required to post any item the publication of which would constitute a violation of state or federal law:
- (A) The names of all faculty members. This information must be posted no later than the first day of the first academic term starting on or after August 1, 2008, and for each academic term thereafter.
- (B) Each faculty member’s credentials. This information must be posted no later than the first day of the first academic term starting on or after August 1, 2008, and for each academic term thereafter.
- (C) No later than ten (10) calendar days before the first day that any student may enroll for the next academic term, all available course information for the next academic term. If course information is not available ten (10) calendar days before the first day that any student may enroll for the next academic term, the institution shall post the information on its website as soon as the information is available. If course information changes at any time before the conclusion of the semester, the institution must update its website to reflect the change(s). This information must be posted before enrollment begins for the first academic term starting on or after August 1, 2008, and every academic term thereafter.
- (3) Where feasible, each institution shall post on its website instructor ratings by students, except that no institution shall be required to post any item the publication of which would constitute a violation of state or federal law.
- (A) The ratings must include:
1. The most recent ratings available; or

2. A faculty member's ratings for multiple academic terms, whether data for each term are presented separately or in aggregate form, so long as the ratings posted include the most recent ratings available.
- (B) Each institution may determine whether to post each faculty member's ratings:
1. As an aggregate representing ratings received for all courses taught by that faculty member; or
 2. For each individual course taught by the faculty member.
- (C) Institutions need not post ratings of faculty members who are teaching for the first time at the institution if no such ratings exist.
- (D) If an institution decides to post ratings for each individual course taught by the faculty member and a faculty member is teaching a course for the first time, the institution need not post ratings for that course if no such ratings exist.
- (E) This information must be posted at least ten (10) calendar days before the first day that any student may enroll for the next academic term, starting with the first academic term starting on or after August 1, 2009, and every academic term thereafter.
- (F) If the Missouri Department of Higher Education ("Department") determines that the ratings posted by an institution do not provide sufficient information, that institution shall work cooperatively with the Department to develop ratings that do provide information the Department deems sufficient.
- (G) Ratings must be posted on a portion of the institution's website that may be viewed by currently enrolled students and by all new students participating in the enrollment process at the institution.

IV. BUDGET AND FINANCE

A. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING

(Adopted by the board October 12, 2006)

It is recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education acknowledge the extensive cooperative work of public college and university presidents and chancellors with legislative leaders in formulating an agreed upon distribution model for the FY 2008 budget recommendation for public colleges and universities.

It is further recommended that the CBHE approve a FY 2008 appropriation request for additional funding totaling \$110,729,288. It is important to note that there remains an unresolved issue raised by community colleges concerning the total amount of their portion of this funding model. Community colleges have agreed to work with legislative leaders to resolve this issue and will present an addendum for CBHE consideration.

This approval is predicated upon the presidents and chancellors working with MDHE and CBHE to design, develop, and implement funding guidelines for both short- and long-term needs for higher education. CBHE strongly encourages the presidents and chancellors to consider the following factors when designing a new set of funding guidelines including, but not limited to, performance funding, FTE sensitivity, periodic equity adjustments, maintenance and repair needs, institutional missions, relationship between state support and tuition policies, capital needs and other related factors.

It is further recommended that the presidents and chancellors work with the leadership of the MDHE in the coming months to propose a performance funding model that includes measurable performance funding indicators for each institution associated with institutional missions. Indicators linked to METS should be given strong consideration. A status report should be provided to the CBHE by its February 2007 meeting.

It is further recommended that members of the CBHE and leadership of the MDHE work with the governor's office and with members of the General Assembly to reach an agreement on both a short- and long-term approach for meeting higher education's needs.

B. HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING POLICIES TASK FORCE

(Recommended by the board April 12, 2006)

The board recommended that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education direct the Commissioner of Higher Education to appoint a task force on development of a new funding formula for higher education. The task force will include representation from the Governor's Office, the Legislature, two-year and four-year sectors, and the Missouri Department of Higher Education Staff. Furthermore, updates on the progress of the task force will be included as an agenda item at future board meetings until the work of the task force has been completed. The Commissioner of Higher Education will design and issue a charge to the task force that incorporates desirable attributes, suggested components to consider, and a reasonable timeline for completion of its task.

C. COMMITMENT TO MODERN EQUIPMENT

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

All state-owned higher educational facilities will be adequately maintained, and modern equipment widely used by business and industry will be available to Missouri's students and faculty.

D. CONTROLLING ADMINISTRATIVE/NONINSTRUCTIONAL FUNDING GROWTH RATES

**(Adopted by the board December 10, 1992;
reaffirmed April 18, 1996)**

Excluding positions funded by grants, contracts, and other restricted income sources, as well as self-supporting auxiliaries, until such time that a Missouri public higher education institution attains ratios for administrative and noninstructional staff-to-faculty that are in the most efficient quartile for comparable institutions nationally, the annual **rate of growth in its administrative and noninstructional personnel shall not exceed one-half the annual rate of growth in full-time faculty.**

E. STUDENT FEES

(Adopted by the board June 10, 1983)

a. Tuition and fee income should reach 33 1/3 percent of cost of education by fiscal year 1986 at the University of Missouri. The University, however, should carefully examine expenditure reduction

and/or other revenue sources before exceeding 33 1/3 percent in the next two years.

b. Tuition and fee income should be 28 percent of the cost of education by fiscal year 1986 at the five regional universities: Central, Southeast, Southwest, Truman, Northwest, and Lincoln University.

c. Tuition and fee income should be 26 percent of the cost of education by fiscal year 1986 at the state four-year colleges: Harris-Stowe, Southern, and Western.

d. The Master Plan III policy that out-of-state tuition in all institutions should be twice the cost of in-state fees is reaffirmed.

F. GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING PRIORITIES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

**(Adopted by the board June 7, 2001;
revised June 14, 2007)**

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education has the statutory responsibility for recommending funding for higher education facilities at Missouri's community colleges, Linn State Technical College, and public four-year universities.

These guidelines for prioritizing capital project requests pertain only to major construction projects in the following categories established by the Office of Administration: Renovation and Rehabilitation; Corrective Construction; Energy Conservation; and New Construction, including planning funds for new construction. It is the current policy of the Coordinating Board that funding for routine maintenance and repair for all institutions should be included in the operating appropriations for the public institutions. Consequently, these guidelines anticipate that maintenance and repair will continue to be considered an on-going operational need that is appropriately addressed in the operating budget.

It is the policy of the Coordinating Board to submit a prioritized request to the Governor and General Assembly for the public four-year universities along with the state's technical college, and a separate prioritized request for community colleges. This separation allows for proper consideration between the different types of institutions with widely varying needs.

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN PRIORITY RANKING

The CBHE goal of providing a coordinated, balanced, and cost-effective delivery system of higher education will provide overall guidance in analyzing existing facility space utilization and in making decisions regarding the need for additional or renovated facilities.

In addition, the following policy statements will be considered when establishing relative priorities for capital funding:

- All proposed projects should be congruent with both the mission of the institution within the system of Missouri higher education and the respective mission implementation plans as reviewed by the Coordinating Board. Campus facility master plans should address this congruence within a five-year projection of facility requirements for the institution based on enrollment and program needs. The campus master plan, including enrollment trends and projections, will therefore serve as the reference point for documenting facility needs. A copy of the current campus master plan should be on file at the Coordinating Board Office.
- Corrective construction and renovation and rehabilitation should, in most instances, precede new construction projects in priority. An institutional decision to retain a facility constitutes an ongoing commitment to bring that facility up to a good condition and to maintain it. Modernization of classrooms and laboratories to incorporate appropriate technology should be an institutional and Coordinating Board priority.
- The addition of new square feet typically requires an ongoing financial commitment for campus security, fuel and utilities, maintenance and repair, etc. Absent justification for additional space based on enrollment change, a direct relationship to an approved mission change or enhancement, and/or the identification of available operational and maintenance funding, any increase in an institution's total square footage should be carefully reviewed and thoroughly justified.
- Projects providing program accessibility to buildings for individuals with physical disabilities shall have a high priority.
- The overall condition of a facility must be considered when evaluating the appropriateness of renovation and the prioritization of capital projects. In some cases, facilities that are in the poorest condition may more properly be candidates for demolition. In other cases, a fiscally responsible deferred maintenance decision may be more appropriate than the development of a capital request. There are other considerations, like state and campus program priorities, that override the

condition of a facility in determining renovation or new construction needs.

- Planning funds should precede funds for new construction and should be requested independently. Planning funds should be used in part to study several alternatives to address programmatic needs. A project with a prior Coordinating Board recommendation and state appropriation for planning funds should be prioritized in a manner reflecting that previous public investment, but may be reviewed again when construction funds are requested for the project.
- Facilities maintained as auxiliary enterprises including, for example, student housing, parking facilities, and facilities related to intercollegiate athletics are considered to be the responsibility of the institution. State funding for construction of facilities serving a dual role involving auxiliary functions and educational and general purposes should be limited to the documented percentage of the facility serving educational and general purposes.
- The state has traditionally attached a 20% match requirement on costs associated with new square footage at Linn State and the universities, and a 50% match on all community college projects. While acknowledging these customary requirements, an institution's ability to access private/local funds should be considered in addition to the nature of the project in determining the percentage of total cost to be requested. The existence or non-existence of an institutional match should not necessarily be determinate of its relative priority or eligibility to be prioritized.

G. APPROPRIATION LEVELS FOR OFF-CAMPUS AND OUT-OF-DISTRICT SITES

(Adopted by the board October 8, 1998)

The total funding recommendation from HB 1456, mission enhancement, and postsecondary technical education to support an off-campus or out-of-district instructional site, shall be limited to fifty (50%) percent of the cost to deliver instruction in that community by single or multiple providers of higher and postsecondary technical education. This policy shall be in effect until such time as the Commissioner of Higher Education and staff, in consultation with community college presidents and chancellors, affected four-year college and university presidents and chancellors, the governor, and legislators propose a set of policy recommendations and incentives that encourage local school districts to annex to established community colleges.

H. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT FUNDING ACT

(Approved by the board December 18, 2007)

General Description and Intent

Tuition is set by the governing board of each Missouri public institution of higher education. Governing board members have relationships with the institutions they represent that give them insight into the needs of the institution, state funding levels, and the extent to which students can be asked to contribute to the cost of their education.

State law, however, now provides for the Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the Commissioner of Higher Education to have some role in reviewing the tuition setting process. Institutions that increase tuition at rates that exceed the rate of inflation must either return a portion of their state appropriations to the state or must ask the Commissioner to waive the financial penalty in whole or in part.

This policy sets forth the statutory language on tuition increases, defines relevant terms, describes the procedures for seeking a waiver, and lists some of the factors the Commissioner may weigh in assessing institutions' waiver requests.

Definitions and Acronyms

- H. Academic year: The academic year shall include the fall and spring terms between August 1 and July 31 of one 365-day period.
- I. Average tuition: The sum of all included institutions' tuition for the current academic year divided by the number of included institutions. This figure will be determined by adding the tuition of each public four-year institution and Linn State Technical College, then dividing by the number of included institutions. If any community college has tuition that exceeds the average tuition at public four-year institutions and Linn State Technical College, the average tuition shall be recalculated to include that community college's tuition.
- J. CBHE: The Coordinating Board for Higher Education.
- K. Commissioner: The Commissioner of Higher Education.
- L. Consumer price index or CPI: The consumer price index for all urban consumers, 1982-1984=100, not seasonally adjusted, as defined and officially recorded by the United States

Department of Labor or its successor agency, for December of the current year compared to December of the previous year.

- M. Fee established by the student body of the institution: Any fee the amount of which has been approved by a majority of students who vote in a campus-wide election or by a majority of members of an officially recognized student government organization popularly elected by the students of an institution or a campus within a multi-campus system.
- N. Fine policy: The requirement that institutions that exceed the limitations on tuition increases set forth in §§ 173.1003.2 and .3, RSMo, remit an amount equal to 5% of their state operating appropriations to the state's general revenue fund, as set forth in § 173.1003.5, RSMo.
- O. FTE: Full time equivalent.
- P. Higher Education Student Funding Act: §§ 173.1000-1003, RSMo.
- Q. Included institution: All institutions that offer four-year degree programs, Linn State Technical College, and any community college that charges out-of-district Missouri residents tuition that exceeds the average tuition.
- R. Institution: An approved public institution of higher education, as defined in § 173.1102, RSMo. An institution that is comprised of more than one campus at which the same level of degree is offered shall constitute one institution for purposes of calculating the average tuition and of seeking a waiver of the fine policy.
- S. MDHE: The Missouri Department of Higher Education.
- T. Notice of tuition change: Written documentation indicating the tuition charged during the current academic year, the tuition that will be charged during the upcoming academic year, and the percentage change in the tuition charged during the current academic year compared to the tuition that will be charged during the upcoming academic year.
- U. State operating appropriation: The total dollar amount appropriated to an institution, exclusive of capital appropriations, by the Missouri legislature per year. This figure shall not include any amount withheld by the governor or the legislature.
- V. Tuition: The amount an institution charges per semester for each of two semesters. Per-semester tuition shall be the average dollar amount an institution charges each Missouri resident undergraduate student enrolled in 15 credit hours plus

each student's required fees; provided, however, that tuition shall include only the fees required of all undergraduate students and shall not include course-specific or program fees.

- a. In the community college context, "tuition" means out-of-taxing-district Missouri resident tuition.
- b. Tuition shall not include course-specific or program fees.
- c. Tuition shall not include any "fee established by the student body of the institution," as that term is defined in section 3F of this policy, after the effective date of the Higher Education Student Funding Act.

Tuition Policy

The Higher Education Student Funding Act provides for the following limitations on tuition increases:

(1) Institutions whose tuition is greater than the average tuition during the current academic year shall not increase tuition for the next academic year at a percentage rate that exceeds the percentage increase in the CPI or zero, whichever is greater.

(2) Institutions whose tuition is less than the average tuition during the current academic year shall not increase tuition for the next academic year in a dollar amount that exceeds the product of either zero or the percentage change in the CPI, whichever is greater, times the average tuition.

(3) A community college shall be required to abide by the limitations set forth in (1) and (2), above, only if its tuition is greater than or equal to the average tuition during the current academic year.

Section 5. Procedures Relating to Tuition

(1) The MDHE will provide written notice to all institutions indicating what the average tuition for the current academic year is by December 1 of each year. This notice will also list which institutions have higher than average tuition, which institutions have lower than average tuition, and which institutions will be exempt from the requirements of the Higher Education Student Funding Act for the upcoming academic year.

(2) The MDHE will provide written notice to all institutions indicating what the CPI was for the previous year by January 15 of each year.

(3) Each institution must submit its notice of tuition change to the CBHE, via the Commissioner, on February 1, March 1, May 1, or July 1 before the start of the next academic year.

(4) The Commissioner will notify each institution, including community colleges, in writing that its notice of tuition change has been received, the date of such receipt, and whether its tuition increase triggers the provisions of § 173.1003, RSMo, within one business day after receiving the institution's notice of tuition change.

(5) Any institution that exceeds the limits set forth in the Higher Education Student Funding Act must remit 5% of its current year state operating appropriation to the state's general revenue fund or must ask the Commissioner for a waiver of the fine policy. In either case, action must be taken no later than 30 calendar days after the institution submits its notice of tuition change.

(6) The waiver request must set forth each factor the institution contends supports its decision to increase tuition in excess of the limits set forth in the Higher Education Student Funding Act.

(7) After the Commissioner receives the waiver request, he/she will arrange to meet with the institution seeking a waiver at a time and place agreeable to all parties. This meeting should take place as soon as possible and may not take place more than 45 calendar days after the institution submits its request for a waiver.

(8) The Commissioner may ask an institution to submit additional written material before or after the meeting. Such requests from the Commissioner may include, among others, information regarding the areas of inquiry listed in section 6 of this policy.

(9) An institution requesting a waiver must provide all information requested by the Commissioner in a timely manner.

(10) All written materials, including but not limited to notices of tuition change and waiver requests, submitted to the Commissioner in connection with Higher Education Student Funding Act will be considered public information and will be posted on the MDHE's website. The MDHE website will specifically advise members of the public that they may submit written comments about any of the posted material to the Commissioner at any time before the meeting of the Commissioner and the institution requesting a waiver takes place. The Commissioner may determine the weight each comment should be afforded and may consider the comments in determining whether to grant a waiver. Copies of all comments must be provided to the

institution requesting a waiver within one business day of the date the comment is received.

(11) Unless otherwise agreed, the meeting of the Commissioner and the institution requesting a waiver will be led by the Commissioner. The institution will have an opportunity to present its rationale for seeking a waiver and to address any comments received from the public. The Commissioner and/or his/her staff will have an opportunity to ask questions of the institution.

(12) The Commissioner will notify the institution whether he/she has determined that its tuition increase is sufficiently warranted within 20 calendar days of the meeting or within 20 calendar days after the institution has provided all information requested by the Commissioner, whichever is later. If the Commissioner finds that the tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted, such notice shall be in writing and shall state the reasons that such increase was deemed not sufficiently warranted. The notice will also inform the institution what percentage, if any, of its state operating appropriation the Commissioner recommends the institution should be required to remit to the state's general revenue fund.

(13) If the Commissioner determines that the tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted, the institution shall have 10 calendar days within which to submit an amended notice of tuition change and the rationale for the tuition rate set forth in the amended notice of tuition change, to agree to increase tuition only at the level permitted by the Higher Education Student Funding Act, or to maintain its original position. In any case, the institution shall notify the Commissioner of its decision in writing within 10 calendar days after the Commissioner notifies the institution that the initial tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted.

(14) If the institution submits an amended notice of tuition change:

- a. The Commissioner shall consider the amended notice of tuition change and the rationale for the tuition rate set forth in the amended notice of tuition change and shall meet with the institution if deemed necessary by the Commissioner.
- b. The Commissioner will notify the institution whether he/she has determined that the tuition increase set forth in the amended notice of tuition change is sufficiently warranted within 20 calendar days of the meeting or within 20 calendar days after the institution has provided all information requested by the Commissioner, whichever is later.

- c. If the Commissioner finds that the tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted, such notice shall be in writing and shall state the reasons that such increase was deemed not sufficiently warranted. The notice will also inform the institution what percentage, if any, of its state operating appropriation the Commissioner recommends the institution should be required to remit to the state's general revenue fund.
- d. If the Commissioner determines that the tuition increase set forth in the institution's amended notice of tuition change is not sufficiently warranted, the institution shall have 10 calendar days within which to either agree to increase tuition only at the level permitted by the Higher Education Student Funding Act or to maintain the position indicated in its amended notice of tuition change. In either case, the institution shall notify the Commissioner of its decision in writing within 10 calendar days after the Commissioner notifies the institution that the amended tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted.
- e. In no case may an institution submit more than one amended notice of tuition change per academic year.

(15) If the Commissioner determines that the tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted and the institution decides to maintain its original position rather than to increase tuition only at the level permitted by the Higher Education Student Funding Act, the Commissioner must notify the CBHE of his/her determination and recommendation as to what percentage of the institution's state operating appropriation the Commissioner recommends the institution should be required to remit to the state's general revenue fund.

(16) If the Commissioner determines that the tuition increase is not sufficiently warranted, the CBHE will determine what, if any, percentage of the institution's state operating appropriation must be remitted to the state's general revenue fund at its next regularly scheduled meeting or at a specially called meeting, by means of a majority vote of all CBHE members present at the meeting, whether present in person or by electronic means; provided, however, that no vote will be made on the matter unless a quorum is established. The institution will have an opportunity to present each factor it believes supports its decision to increase tuition to the CBHE. The CBHE's decision will be binding and final.

(17) If the CBHE votes to impose a fine, the fine shall be a percentage of the state operating appropriation for the fiscal year

before the academic year during which the tuition increase will take effect. The fine shall be a one-time fine only. The institution shall remit the fine to the state's general revenue fund no more than 30 calendar days after the date the CBHE votes to impose a fine.

(18) All written material submitted by an institution in connection with the Higher Education Student Funding Act shall be submitted in electronic form.

(19) The Commissioner, at his/her discretion, may agree to extend any deadline described in this policy.

(20) Throughout his/her tenure, the Commissioner will be committed to addressing waiver requests in a timely manner. Failure by the Commissioner to meet any deadline described in this policy shall not, however, invalidate the process.

(21) This policy is not intended to inhibit institutions' ability to engage in conversations with the Commissioner, MDHE staff, or the CBHE about issues of interest to members of the higher education community, including tuition.

(22) The MDHE will request, and institutions will provide, information about the number of students enrolled at satellite or branch campuses, in online classes, or in distance education programs at each institution, and the tuition charged for each such type of education.

Areas of Inquiry

The Commissioner shall consider all written and verbal information provided by an institution in the waiver request process. Specifically, the Commissioner shall consider:

(1) The relationship between state appropriations and the consumer price index. State appropriations means the state operating appropriation for the prior year per FTE student for the prior year compared to the state operating appropriation for the current year per FTE student for the prior year; and

(2) Extraordinary circumstances.

In addition, the institution may also submit, or the Commissioner may request, information regarding topics included but not limited to:

(1) Mandatory costs that have increased at a rate that exceeds the CPI, including but not limited to increased costs incurred in connection with the implementation of new mandates or legal requirements.

(2) Historical trends in state operating appropriations, tuition policy, and other financial issues and relationships.

(3) Costs related to the institution's mission that require growth in revenues in excess of the CPI.

(4) Costs related to other initiatives designed to meet specific needs of the state of Missouri that require growth in revenues in excess of the CPI.

(5) The current and/or historical structure of the institution's total budget, including the institution's allocations for faculty and non-faculty salaries, institutional financial aid, student support, research, physical plant maintenance, and other operational activities.

(6) Damage, destruction, or deterioration of facilities, infrastructure, property, or other physical assets of an institution for which there are insufficient funds from state appropriations or insurance proceeds to repair or replace.

Public comments about the material posted on the MDHE's website pertaining to the institution's waiver request.

V. INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

A. TELECOMMUNICATIONS-BASED DELIVERY SYSTEM POLICIES

**(Adopted by the board February 2, 1989;
revised June 13, 1996)**

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education:

- a. Supports the application of telecommunications-based delivery by encouraging the utilization of telecommunications technology through partnership arrangements among institutions.
- b. Encourages telecommunications-based delivery systems through the board's funding guidelines to ensure the effective use of such technology.
- c. Requires that programs delivered through telecommunications take place within the context of an institution's educational mission.
- d. Recommends the development and use of rigorous outcomes measures to assess program effectiveness.
- e. Advocates approval of programs delivered via telecommunications not be contingent upon specific site approval. The process should require that each program meet or exceed explicit requirements of quality standards, including the provision of adequate library and other support services. (The current program approval procedures of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education are applied when full degree programs are proposed that are delivered via telecommunications.)

B. STATE PLAN FOR A TELECOMMUNICATIONS-BASED SYSTEM

(Adopted by the board June 13, 1996)

The CBHE adopted a philosophical framework and specific recommendations for a learner-centered system of higher education that will be progressive, flexible and cooperative. The system features the use of advance telecommunications to increase statewide access to education opportunities at all levels.

The CBHE telecommunications plan states that:

Missouri will be best served by a system that builds on existing networks and supports existing colleges and universities in using telecommunications technologies to make their high-quality programs readily accessible to citizens throughout the state.

Increased access to higher education programs for all Missourians can be accomplished most effectively and efficiently through partnerships among institutions of higher education, public and independent, to provide courses, degrees and training, consistent with institutional missions, to individuals and locations throughout the state using appropriate telecommunications technologies.

The collective access and network capacity needs of the higher education community need to be explicitly included in the state's plan to design and implement an expanded statewide voice/video/data network. Colleges and universities, public and independent, must move quickly to provide these access and network capacity needs to state planners.

State funding recommendations should include funding for the expansion of the state information technology backbone. CBHE funding recommendations should include funding for information technology infrastructure development at each public institution, including funding for maintenance and support as part of core institutional budgets.

The CBHE should revise its program approval procedures, funding guidelines, and other agency policies as necessary to provide timely support to both educational partnering and the delivery of high quality education through telecommunications.

All higher education institutions should adopt a common system for the electronic exchange of student transcript and financial aid data. This will be essential for providing financial aid for students simultaneously taking courses at more than one institution.

The recommendations provide initial guidance to institutions and partnerships on meeting the needs of distant learners for convenient access to the resources needed to support their learning, including: financial aid; advising; course registration; library resources; information on institutional fees and requirements; consumer protection information; necessary training in utilizing technology resources; feedback through assessment of student outcomes; and timely availability of all courses needed to complete certificates or program.

All library collections in the state should be viewed as a collective resource for higher education learners. Statewide access to library resources will require a coordinated system for the requesting and quick delivery of materials to any location in the state, as well as statewide student access to reference services and training in information retrieval.

The resource group recognizes the importance of faculty involvement in the delivery of distance education and urges institutions to: involve faculty in the design of distance education

courses and programs; provide faculty with professional development in distance education as needed; and incorporate incentives and rewards for distance education instruction and scholarship.

Because this report does not represent the end of the process, but the beginning of a distance learning system, and advisory group representing all of Missouri's higher education community should be established immediately to address emerging issues related to state and regional needs, technological infrastructure and policy.

C. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR A TELECOMMUNICATIONS-BASED DELIVERY SYSTEM

(Adopted by the board June 13, 1996)

The plan contained the following principles to describe the fundamental assumptions that will guide the development of Missouri's telecommunications-based delivery system, and to provide a philosophical framework for the additional work of the group.

a. The system must be learner-centered. Any decision regarding the system should consider the perspective of the student over that of individual institutions.

b. The system should provide learners in all locations with access to a broad spectrum of high-quality education opportunities at an equitable price.

c. The system must support the sharing of resources for education and economic development among educational entities, governmental agencies, hospitals, libraries, communities, and business and industry.

d. Because no one technology can meet all needs, the system should support multiple technologies, based on internationally adopted standards. Where appropriate, the system should have the capacity to integrate voice, video, and data, and should allow multiple concurrent sessions.

e. The system must be flexible, having the capacity to integrate existing technologies, incorporate evolving technologies, and grow with demand.

f. The effectiveness of the system should be evaluated and improved continually, and related CBHE policies should be updated as necessary to support the system.

D. ROLE OF THE CBHE IN SUPPORTING A TELECOMMUNICATIONS-BASED DELIVERY SYSTEM

(Adopted by the board June 13, 1996)

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education shall:

a. Review the existing CBHE policies on (a) delivery of education through telecommunications and (b) the review of academic programs, and update them as appropriate. Special attention should be paid to funding guidelines that support the effective use of telecommunications for enhanced accessibility.

b. Promote the formation of formal partnerships among institutions of higher education, both public and independent, and encourage resource sharing between higher education and businesses, community information networks, libraries, high school, extension centers, etc.

c. Cooperate with educational and cultural institutions and other state agencies to strengthen the state's bargaining position with vendors that supply telecommunications equipment and network capacity. Immediate attention should be directed to expanding network capacity throughout the education community.

d. Appoint a distance learning planning group representing Missouri's public and independent higher education institutions to work on distance learning issues as they emerge.

e. Propose legislation and amend existing administrative rules so that grants and scholarships can be awarded to eligible students enrolled at multiple institutions in distance education programs.

E. IMPLEMENTATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS-BASED DELIVERY SYSTEM

(Adopted by the board June 12, 1997)

The June 1996 Telecommunications-based Delivery System report called for the establishment of an advisory group representing all of Missouri's higher education community to address emerging issues related to state and regional needs, technological infrastructure and policy. That advisory group made recommendations, which were adopted by the board for the next steps for continued implementation of Missouri's telecommunications-based delivery system. These recommendations represent phase two in the development of Missouri's telecommunications-based delivery system for postsecondary education. The 1996 report challenged the state's

public and independent colleges and universities to use inter-institutional partnering and emerging telecommunications technologies to improve citizens' access to education. Building on that report and through the mission review process, Missouri's postsecondary education system has initiated regional educational councils and consortia, developed needed distance education programs, and expanded the capacity of its telecommunications network. The following specific recommendations were adopted for continued implementation of a telecommunications-based delivery system.

Moving Beyond Barriers of Place and Time

1. The most cost-effective way to increase Missourians' access to quality postsecondary education is to extend programs and services wherever, whenever and however they are needed using the telecommunications-based delivery system and collaboration among Missouri public and independent colleges and universities.

A Focus on Partnerships and Collaboration

2. Through the mission review process and legislative appropriation requests, several consortia and collaborative partnerships have been supported. These initial efforts should be fostered and encouraged as a cost-effective way to deliver needed programs and services.

3. Missouri colleges and universities must ensure that customer and market needs drive program and delivery decisions. These principal customers include traditional students, lifelong learners, the professions, business and industry, economic development councils and other consumers of Missouri postsecondary education.

4. Regional planning organizations and partnerships must serve as effective mechanisms for meeting customer needs. These organizations should bring together representatives of public and independent colleges and universities in the region, other Missouri institutions that wish to serve the region, and the region's principal customers. Needs assessment and joint long-range planning should drive decisions about program delivery, partners from both inside and outside the regions should be encouraged to collaborate.

5. Participation in a regional planning organization involves both responsibilities and opportunities, and members should have a proactive and cooperative approach. Such organizations should adopt a set of customer-focused principles similar to those suggested in this report to guide their operation. Their decisions should support cost-effective use of state resources and discourage

unnecessary program duplication. Requests for new program approval submitted by institutions to the CBHE should reflect the support of regional partners.

6. The CBHE should encourage and support collaborative partnerships and programs and periodically convene leaders of regional planning organizations to promote communication and facilitate intra- and inter-regional cooperation to meet statewide education needs.

Providing Needed Quality Programs

7. The CBHE's legislative appropriation requests should support the delivery of cooperative distance education programs, especially those activities that meet state or regional needs that are not attractive to entrepreneurial providers, and that promote creative, cutting-edge approaches. An advisory committee should help set an agenda for the development of programs that match the distance learning needs of Missouri.

8. It will be crucial to continually assess and improve the quality of Missouri's telecommunications-based delivery system. The best way to certify the quality of student learning via distance learning programs is through the use of well-defined exit competencies.

Seamless Student Support Services

9. Students pursuing courses and programs via telecommunications need convenient access to the information and support services necessary for their success. Some support services should be provided by state initiative, such as the development of a smart on-line catalogue, maintenance of a clearinghouse for student academic records, and reform in state financial aid rules. Further study of issues related to the electronic transfer of student eligibility data and electronic delivery of funds is recommended. Other support services should be provided collaboratively by institutions closest to students regardless of the origin of programming.

Library Resources for Distance Learning

10. Distance education students need convenient access to digital and conventional library resources appropriate to their course and program needs. Missouri should invest in improved Internet-based access to digitized and multimedia library resources as well as a common library platform to strengthen the intellectual resources base available to both distant and campus-based learners.

Faculty Roles and Support in Distance Learning

11. Faculty are central to the success of distance education and must receive appropriate support. The combined capacities of the state's colleges and universities can be used to provide a "virtual" distance education academy for faculty, utilizing expertise from across the state. Two institutions have, through the mission review process and legislative appropriations, received responsibility to take a leadership role in offering faculty training in the use of advanced technologies for distance education, and the opportunity to develop skills in the design and assessment of courses and programs to be delivered using these technologies. Expertise of other institutions should be utilized in this initiative as well.

12. Faculty participating in distance education must have institutional support from administrators and colleagues, as well as appropriate resources and technical support.

Cooperative Technology Strategies

13. Advances in Internet-based technologies are leading to the inevitable integration of voice, video, and data transmissions as well as increased demand for network access and capacity. Missouri should expand its investment in a telecommunications infrastructure that supports this scenario and initiate pilot projects that use the Internet to link one or more regional IT-V networks. If investments are to be made in dedicated lines and two-way video switching technologies, institutions are encouraged to adopt compressed approaches using the H.320 standard and fractional T1 lines whenever possible.

Next Steps

14. CBHE staff should work with appropriate institutional personnel or others to develop cost estimates for the above projects and recommendations for best ways to implement them, whether via CBHE initiative, institutional initiatives or external contracts, in time for inclusion in the Fiscal Year 1999 budget where possible.

15. The progress of the telecommunications-based delivery system toward achieving its goals of customer focus, partnering, increased access, quality and cost-efficiency should be reexamined every two years by a representative statewide group.

F. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS TO BE CONSIDERED TO ACCESS MORENET SERVICES

(Adopted by the board February 7, 2002)

Eligibility criteria for proprietary schools to be considered to access MOREnet services:

- The proprietary institution expresses and interest in receiving MOREnet services.
- The proprietary institution is accredited by a recognized regional or national accrediting organization.
- The proprietary institution grants degrees at the associate level or above.
- The proprietary institution has been operating in Missouri at least fifty years or whose main campus is located in Missouri.
- The proprietary institution has been certified by the Coordinating Board's Proprietary School Certification Program.

Furthermore, it is recommended that the fee structures established for proprietary schools given access to MOREnet services *at least* ensure the recovery of the full cost for these services.

G. COMMON LIBRARY PLATFORM -- MOBIUS

(Adopted by the board April 16, 1998)

The development of a statewide automated library system employing a common platform for Missouri public and independent academic libraries was identified as a priority in both telecommunications plans. The report, *Missouri Academic Libraries and Their Automated Futures*, prepared by consultant. Joseph Ford and Associates, Inc. (funded by the Council on Public Higher Education) was prepared in close cooperation with the academic librarians and the CBHE staff. On April 18, 1998 the CBHE encouraged Missouri's two- and four-year public and independent colleges and universities to form a consortium as outlined in a memorandum of understanding and to make prompt appointments of institutional representatives. The initial purpose of the consortium is to implement the Common Library Platform and to organize a document delivery system among academic libraries. The board also recommended that the Missouri State Library be invited to join the consortium; that subject to discussion and approval by the CBHE Presidential Advisory Committee (which was done on April 18, 1998), the consortium be structured as outlined in the memorandum of understanding; that the Commissioner of Higher Education be authorized to sign the memorandum of understanding on behalf of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education; and as authorized by 173.020(3) RSMo the CBHE provide appropriate assistance to the consortium during its organization and its operation as a consortium. This assistance shall include the function of requesting and receiving state appropriations on behalf of the consortium.

H. APPOINTMENT OF THE CBHE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND INSTRUCTION

(Established by the board October 8, 1998)

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education, in consultation with the Commissioner of Higher Education and the CBHE Presidential Advisory Committee, shall appoint a standing advisory committee to advise and make recommendations to the board in order to advance the higher education agenda in the use of technology in the acceleration of learning

I. MISSOURI LEARNER'S NETWORK

(Endorsed by the board October 7, 1999)

The Coordinating Board for Higher Education endorsed the development of a Missouri Learner's Network to facilitate Missourians' access to information about off-campus credit courses and degree programs.

J. PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE FOR DISTANCE LEARNING/WEB-BASED COURSES

(Adopted by the board April 13, 2000)

When providing courses and programs through distance learning methods, institutions should establish standards and encourage academic integrity equivalent to courses offered in a traditional, campus-based environment. These Principles of Good Practice, adapted from the 1999 Guidelines for Distance Education by the North Central Association Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NCA), are suggested as a guide for Missouri institutions as they develop and implement courses for, and assess their involvement in, distance education and web-based course delivery.

The intent of these principles is to encourage reflection on quality and best practices as faculty and institutions negotiate the rapidly changing and sometimes unfamiliar territory that such courses inherently have. Institutions are encouraged to operationalize these principles in locally directed ways that result in meaningful steps toward ensuring high quality.

I. Distance learning courses and programs, including web-based courses, should maintain high academic integrity.

- Institutions should ensure both the rigor of courses and the quality of instruction.

- Institutions should ensure that the technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of each course.
- Institutions should ensure the currency of materials, programs, and courses.
- Each institution's distance education policies regarding ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products should be clear and in writing.
- Institutions should provide appropriate faculty support services specifically related to distance education.
- Institutions should provide appropriate technological and pedagogical training for faculty who teach distance education courses/web-based courses.
- Faculty should engage in timely and adequate interaction with students and, when appropriate, should encourage interaction among students.
- Institutions should ensure that distance learning courses and web-based courses apply toward degrees and that there is sufficient explanation to the distance learner how those courses apply toward degrees.

II. Distance learning and web-based courses and programs should be assessed and evaluated regularly.

- Institutions should assess student capability to succeed in distance education programs and should apply this information to admission and recruiting policies and decisions.
- Institutions should evaluate the educational effectiveness of their distance education programs and web-based courses (including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction) to ensure comparability to campus-based programs.
- Institutions should ensure that the performance of distance learning faculty and faculty involved in providing web-based courses is evaluated in a fashion that is at least as rigorous as the performance of their peers who do not teach distance learning courses.
- Institutions should ensure, to a reasonable extent, the integrity of student work.

III. Institutions involved in distance education and web-based instruction should ensure that students have access to adequate resources and services.

- Institutions should have access to the equipment and technical expertise required for distance education.
- Institutions should ensure that students have access to, and can effectively use, appropriate library resources (through traditional and electronic means), including MOBIUS, a consortium of Missouri's academic libraries.
- Institutions should monitor whether students make appropriate use of learning resources.
- Institutions should provide laboratories, facilities, equipment, and software appropriate to the courses or programs and/or make clear to students the responsibilities they have to provide their own such equipment.
- Institutions should provide adequate access to a range of student services appropriate to support distance learning courses and programs, including (but not limited to) admissions, enrollment, assessment, tutorials, special needs access, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of course materials, placement, and counseling.
- Institutions should provide an adequate means for resolving student complaints.
- Institutions should provide students with information that adequately and accurately represents the programs, requirements, and services available.
- Institutions should ensure that students enrolled in courses possess the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the technology employed in the program and should provide aid to students who are experiencing difficulty using the required technology.

VI. CONTRACTING FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

A. RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT: MISSOURI/KANSAS RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT FOR ARCHITECTURE, DENTISTRY, AND OPTOMETRY

(Revised version adopted by the board February 9, 2007)

**MISSOURI - KANSAS AGREEMENT ON ARCHITECTURE,
DENTISTRY, AND OPTOMETRY**

AN AGREEMENT

**By and Between the Kansas Board of Regents, The Missouri Coordinating Board for
Higher Education, and The Curators of the University of Missouri
Regarding Reciprocal Tuition and the Exchange of Students**

In order to expand student access to academic programming not available in the respective states of Missouri and Kansas and to promote the efficient utilization of existing resources, the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the Curators of the University of Missouri agree to establish a reciprocal tuition agreement for Missouri residents desiring to study in the professionally accredited architecture, architectural engineering, landscape architecture, or interior architecture programs in the School of Architecture and Urban Design at the University of Kansas or the College of Architecture and Design at Kansas State University, and for Kansas residents desiring to study accredited professional programs in the School of Dentistry at the University of Missouri-Kansas City or optometry at the University of Missouri-St. Louis School, of Optometry. The following provisions and procedures shall govern this agreement.

I. Admission Requirements

Missouri students desiring to study in the Kansas programs under this agreement shall apply directly to the Kansas programs for admission and must be granted unconditional admission to the appropriate professional school in accordance with customary institutional procedures. Kansas students desiring to study in the Missouri programs under this agreement shall apply to the Kansas Board of Regents to be designated as a potential applicant. Kansas students interested in optometry shall only be designated as a potential applicant if they agree to comply with the requirements of K.S.A. 74-3270 through 74-3273, including engaging in the practice of optometry in Kansas on a full-time basis following successful completion of the optometry program. After receiving the designation as potential applicants, Kansas students shall apply directly to the Missouri programs for admission and must be granted

unconditional admission to the appropriate professional school in accordance with customary institutional procedures. Once admitted, students covered by this agreement shall be entitled to all customary rights and privileges accorded out-of-state students.

II. Limitations on Number of Reciprocal Tuition Waivers

The institutions participating in this reciprocal tuition agreement may admit as many Kansas or Missouri students to the programs under this agreement as may qualify for admission although they shall endeavor to structure admissions so a reasonably steady flow of new students can be maintained from one year to the next. However, the total number of out-of-state tuition waivers under this agreement for all students shall be 97 for Kansas residents, with 85 Kansas residents in the UMKC School of Dentistry and 12 Kansas residents in the University of Missouri-St. Louis, School of Optometry. For Missouri residents, a total of 491 out-of-state tuition waivers in the architecture programs at both Kansas institutions combined shall be available. The number of waivers for architecture students shall be divided between the University of Kansas and Kansas State University, as determined by the Kansas Board of Regents, to ensure an equitable distribution of total waivers between the two institutions.

Any present or future bilateral articulation agreements between a Missouri institution and the Kansas Board of Regents regarding architecture education and any subsequent award of out-of-state tuition waivers shall not be a part of this agreement and shall not reduce the limit of 491 tuition waivers for Missouri students studying architecture at these Kansas institutions as established by this agreement. Any present or future bilateral articulation agreements between a Missouri institution and the Kansas Board of Regents regarding dentistry or optometry education and any subsequent award of out-of-state tuition waivers shall not be a part of this agreement and shall not reduce the limit of 97 tuition waivers for Kansas students studying dentistry or optometry at these Missouri institutions as established by this agreement.

III. Purchase of Additional Waivers

On a space-available basis as determined by the admitting institution(s), either state may elect to purchase additional waivers beyond the limits stated in Section II by paying the difference between in-state and out-of-state fees. The number of waivers purchased shall be dependent upon appropriations for that purpose and the expanded limit established by the admitting institution. In order to exercise this option, the interested state shall inform its counterpart of its intent not later than July 15 or the prior academic year.

IV. General Student Eligibility Standards

To be eligible to receive a waiver of out-of-state tuition fees under this agreement and to qualify for an annual renewal of the waivers, a student must satisfy the following criteria:

A. Demonstrate that he or she satisfies the residency requirements of his or her respective home state. In cases of dispute, the final decision on residency shall be made by the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education for Missouri students and by the Kansas Board of Regents for Kansas students.

B. Maintain full-time, continuous enrollment, not including summer sessions. Exceptions to this provision shall be limited to (1) a student who must interrupt his/her studies owing to a bona fide medical problem, as determined jointly by the student's physician and the institution, and (2) a student who receives an approved leave of absence from the academic program in which he or she is enrolled.

C. Maintain satisfactory academic progress and good behavior as defined by the admitting institution.

D. Sign a FERPA release form to permit the administering institution to fulfill reporting requirements of Section X.

V. Status of Current Students

Subject to the availability of tuition waivers under the limits established by this agreement, all eligible students enrolled on April 1, 2006, in one of the schools specified in this agreement with an out-of-state tuition waiver shall continue to receive an out-of-state waiver during the duration of this agreement provided he or she continues to satisfy the eligibility criteria in Section IV. Continued eligibility for waivers in subsequent terms shall be governed by the remaining provisions of this agreement.

Former students with advanced standing who are presently on an approved leave of absence and who would otherwise have been eligible to receive a tuition waiver this past year shall also qualify for a waiver under the same provisions as other current continuing students.

VI. Priority Ranking for Classes of Students

In the event that more students are eligible for tuition waivers than permitted by the limits established in Section II plus any additional waivers purchased under Section III, the following priority ranking for classes of students shall be followed for the assignment of tuition waiver recipients, subject to the limits on eligibility as defined in the provisions of this agreement.

A. First priority shall be given to all full-time, continuing students in good standing who have already begun their professional course work and who had, during the previous academic term, a tuition waiver or a waiver purchased by their home state with the exception that no students shall receive a waiver for more academic years of subsidized study than ordinarily required by a full-time student to complete a degree program in a field of study included in this agreement, as determined by the admitting institution.

B. Second priority shall be given to all first-time entering students and any continuing students in good standing who did not have a waiver during the previous academic term.

VII. Rank Ordering to Eligible Students within Classes

If only a portion of all continuing students who held a waiver the previous term can be awarded a waiver in the upcoming term, all second-year (sophomore) students shall be rank ordered in the manner described in this section, and all waivers that are available for students in this group shall be awarded on a competitive basis. Similarly, if only a portion of all first-time entering students and continuing students who did not receive a waiver the previous term can be awarded a waiver, all of these students shall be rank ordered in the manner described, and all waivers that are available for students in this group shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

Eligible students affected by the provisions of this section shall be rank ordered in terms of academic performance and unmet financial need as determined by the admitting institution. The student at the top of the rank-ordered list shall receive the first available out-of-state tuition waiver, and all remaining waivers shall be awarded in descending order of priority ranking.

Eligible students who do not receive a waiver as a result of this process shall constitute a rank-ordered waiting list that shall be utilized as described in Section VIII.

VIII. Waiting Lists

In the event a student receiving a tuition waiver under this agreement terminates his or her studies during the fall term or otherwise becomes ineligible, the admitting institution shall, at the beginning of the subsequent spring term, assign the vacant waiver to the first eligible student on the waiting list established in Section VII. The waiting list at each institution shall be recalculated at the end of each term. Students entering at mid-year shall be added to the institution's waiting list for that year.

IX. Nondiscriminatory Selection Procedures

The admission of students and the assignment of waivers under this agreement shall be accomplished in accordance with all applicable state and federal nondiscrimination statutes.

X. Reporting Requirements

Within fifteen (15) working days following the official census date for each institution for both the fall and spring terms, each participating institution shall provide the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri a summary report on the students receiving a tuition waiver under this agreement. This report shall include the name, address, classification status, and major of each student receiving an out-of-state tuition waiver. This report shall also include the name and address, in rank order, of students on any waiting lists that may have been established.

XI. Implementation

This agreement shall become effective July 1, 2006, and shall remain in effect until June 30, 2011, with the proviso that in the event this agreement is not renewed or extended, students enrolled in a program who hold out-of-state tuition waivers under this agreement at the time it expires shall continue to receive this benefit until their graduation or until they would otherwise become ineligible under the terms of this agreement. Representatives of the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri, as designated by each organization, shall meet, as determined necessary and appropriate by the parties, to evaluate this agreement.

XII. General

A. Any notices or other communications required or permitted to be given or delivered hereunder shall be in writing and shall be sufficiently given if delivered personally or sent by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, to the parties at their addresses first appearing above or at such other addresses as either party may from time to time designate to the other in writing, and such notice or other communication shall be deemed to be given as of the date it was personally delivered or deposited in the mail, as the case may be.

B. That none of the terms or conditions herein shall in any manner be altered, amended, waived, or abandoned except by written agreement of the parties, and no delay by a party in enforcing any of its rights hereunder shall be deemed a waiver of such rights.

C. In the event that any condition, covenant, or other provision herein contained is held to be invalid or void by any court of competent jurisdiction, the same shall in no way affect any other

condition, covenant, or other provision herein contained. If such condition, covenant, or other provision shall be deemed invalid due to its scope or breadth, such condition, covenant, or other provision shall be deemed valid to the extent of the scope or breadth permitted by law.

This agreement sets forth the entire understanding of the parties and supersedes any and all prior agreements, arrangements, and understandings relating to the subject matter hereof. This agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the parties and their respective successors, legal representatives, and assigns. The article or section headings, if any, of this agreement are for convenience of reference only and do not form a part hereof and do not in any way modify, interpret, or construe the intentions of the parties. This agreement shall be executed in one or more counterparts, and all such counterparts shall constitute one and the same instrument. The person who executes this contract on behalf of a party to the contract expressly represents and warrants that he/she has the full and complete authority to do so.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement and/or authorized the same to be executed by their duly authorized representatives as of the date shown below the respective signatures, said agreement to become effective as of the later date.

[Signature blocks omitted]

B. MIDWESTERN HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION: MIDWEST STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

(Adopted by the board March 25, 1993)

The Midwest Student Exchange Program (MSEP) is an arrangement among interested Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) member states through which states may list undergraduate and graduate programs (including professional programs) or institutions in which they are prepared to enroll students from other MHEC states, within specified numbers if desired, at a reduced proportion of the institution's regular tuition charge.

The program, involving reciprocal reduction of tuition by the participating states, expands educational opportunities for students and facilitates more efficient use of resources at the institution or the program level. At a time when conservation of resources and avoidance of needless duplication are of concern in all states, reciprocal arrangements provide a tool for use in both institutional and state-level academic planning.

For these reasons, the State of Missouri, acting through the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education joins with other states

through the Midwestern Higher Education Commission in creating the Midwest Student Exchange Program. This action attests to the state's interest in the creation of an agreement through which midwestern states may maintain or expand the range of educational programs available to their residents and supplement enrollments in designated institutions or programs, as each state's needs, plans, and decisions indicate. This agreement does not commit the state to receive or to send students in the MSEP at any time; active exchange of students may occur when the state finds that to be advantageous. Bilateral agreements for exchange or students may exist.

The program will operate with reference to the following general conditions and responsibilities of the parties. It is to be expected that experience with the program will suggest modifications from time to time. Such modifications may become effective as agreed upon by the Council (see following section), except that the Council or MHEC staff will recommend to the MHEC Commission policies and procedures that in the judgment of either may have significant impact on the program. Notwithstanding any other review of MSEP that may be undertaken, a thorough assessment of the program and its outcomes will be undertaken by MHEC and participating states each four years, with a report to the MHEC Commission.

General Conditions

1. MHEC will establish the Midwest Student Exchange Program Council, comprising of one member designated by the appropriate postsecondary education authority in each state that elects to execute this Agreement, and four at-large members chosen by the MHEC Commissioner representing the doctoral research universities, regional universities and colleges, community and technical colleges, and the independent institutions. Each council member shall have on vote. The Council will be supported by a MHEC staff member designated by the President; this staff member will serve as Council chair. The Council will encourage and facilitate requests of participating states for the inclusion in MSEP of degree programs to which such states desire access for their student; prepare a listing of programs and institutions ready to receive MSEP students in the following year; assess the operation of the program; and recommend policies and procedures to support the administration of the agreements set forth therein.

2. Programs in public institutions designated by the participating states shall be open to MSEP students at 150 percent of the regular tuition* charged resident students in the same program/institutions. Independent institutions are encouraged to participate as well, and may do so by making programs available to MSEP students at a reduction from their regular tuition of at least 10 percent. In certain high cost professional fields, as approved by the Council, admission as an MSEP student may entail payment, by the student's home state or by the student, of an additional amount. These tuition policies for

MSEP students may be changed by the MHEC Commissioner upon recommendation of the MSEP Council, for any academic year beginning at least one calendar year from the state of the Commission action.

*For purposes of this program, “tuition” is defined as the basic, comprehensive multipurpose educational charge all students are required to pay as a condition of enrollment. This charge may or may not be known as “tuition.” Other designations may include educational fee, registration fee, incidental fee, or perhaps others. “Tuition” does not include special fee charges such as student activity and required insurance assessments.

3. MSEP tuition is to be available to admitted students while the student continues in the program in which admitted as a MSEP student. Change to another program (in the same or a different institution) may be made at the reduced tuition level only if the new program is also open to MSEP students and the change is approved by the institution.

4. MSEP programs in public institutions shall be available to students only at the degree level at which the student’s home state agrees to receive MSEP students—i.e., a student may enroll in a public institution at the associate, baccalaureate, or graduate level only if his/her home state agrees to receive MSEP students from other participating states at the same level.

5. Admission of students to designated programs is exclusively a decision of each participating institution. However, in determining eligibility for MSEP tuition, any differences of view that cannot be resolved between institution and student will be resolved at the state level under procedures established by the state (normally, by the state postsecondary education authority).

Responsibilities of States

1. In each state the appropriate postsecondary education agency will designate a single person as MSEP liaison and as a member of the MSEP Council. A state may identify additional persons to work with the designated liaison; it may send such persons to Council meetings as observer-participants, without vote. Council members will be expected to participate in meetings of the Council. Council members may, however, provide for an authorized representative, with vote, if unable to attend.

2. Through procedures established by each state, the liaison will identify institutions and/or programs that will admit MSEP students. While normally, institutions will admit MSEP students to the eligible programs on a “space available” basis, institutions/states may provide for limitations of numbers at the program, institution, or statewide level. The state liaison will be prepared to submit

information concerning institutions/programs that will receive MSEP students, and any limitations, annually as required in the operation of the program.

3. Each participating state is encouraged to identify fields, programs, and institutions in other participating states to which it would like to have access for its residents. The MSEP liaison person should be informed concerning such requests or inquiries; he/she in turn will so advise the MHEC program coordinator and liaison persons in the other affected states, at the earliest possible time. MHEC will take all steps appropriate to encourage inclusion of such requested programs in the Exchange.

4. Each participating state is responsible for publicizing throughout the state the opportunities available to its residents through MSEP. Among other means, the state will distribute widely to school counselors, parents and students an annual catalog describing MSEP and listing institutions and programs available to its residents, as well as instruction as to how interested students may apply (applicants simply indicate "MSEP Applicant" on their admissions applications). The annual listing of available institutions and programs will be compiled by MHEC.

5. The state will take steps to assure necessary institutional record-keeping and reporting to enable the appropriate state agency, through the MSEP liaison, to provide MHEC each fall a list and report of MSEP students by state of their residency, institution and program in which enrolled, and year of MSEP status (i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th). Where state higher education structure makes different reporting arrangements appropriate, the MSEP liaison will negotiate arrangements with MHEC staff that are mutually acceptable.

6. The state agrees that the MSEP tuition status of any student will be continued during that student's satisfactory progress or approved leave status in the program in which admitted, without regard to termination of MSEP participation by either the sending or the receiving state.

Responsibilities of MHEC

1. MHEC will convene the MSEP Council annually or as MHEC or the Council deem necessary to review operations, policies, and procedures and to formulate recommendations for the Program. The MHEC staff coordinator will provide the Council information and support appropriate for its monitoring role and its role in advising the MHEC President and Commission of any problems, needed changes, etc.

2. MHEC will compile the annual listing of institutions/programs and conditions applying thereto, and will make the relevant

information available to each participating state either in print or in computer-usable form.

3. Annually, MHEC will survey liaisons (or other persons designated by the state, as agreed upon by MHEC) for all MSEP enrollment information to be summarized and reported to the MSEP Council and others for assistance in monitoring and evaluating the program.

This instrument shall be effective upon signature by the state and MHEC. Participating states may send and/or receive students in the Midwest Student Exchange Program at any time under the policies and procedures stated above.

Adopted by the Midwest Student Exchange Program Council
January 19, 1993.

[Signature blocks omitted]

VII. STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

A. ACCESS MISSOURI

(Promulgation authorized by the board December 6, 2007)

6 CSR 10- 2.140 Institutional Eligibility for Student Participation

(1) Definitions.

(A) Access Missouri shall mean the Access Missouri Financial Assistance Program set forth in sections 173.1101 - 173.1107, RSMo.

(B) Approved institution means any institution located in the state of Missouri that meets the requirements set forth in section 173.1102(2) or (3), RSMo, that has been approved under 6 CSR 10-2.140, and that has been approved to participate in the federal student financial assistance programs created in Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

(C) Approved private institution means an educational institution as defined in section 173.1102(2), RSMo.

(D) Approved public institution means an educational institution as defined in section 173.1102(3), RSMo.

(E) CBHE means the Coordinating Board for Higher Education created by section 173.005, RSMo.

(F) Department means the Department of Higher Education created by section 173.005, RSMo.

(G) His, him, or he shall apply equally to the female as well as the male sex where applicable in this rule.

(H) Standard admission policies shall mean policies approved and published by the approved institution to admit special students and students with a certificate of graduation from high school or the equivalent of that certificate.

(2) Policy.

(A) The CBHE is charged by statute to promulgate reasonable rules and regulations to affect the purposes of the Access Missouri program. In establishing this rule of institutional eligibility, the

CBHE is guided principally by the constitution of Missouri; the provisions of sections 173.1101 - 173.1107, RSMo; and decisions of the Missouri Supreme Court construing the laws of the state.

(B) The CBHE will administer the Access Missouri program as a need-based student financial assistance program to assist financially qualified full-time students enrolled in approved institutions of higher education.

(3) Institutional Eligibility.

(A) Only institutions certified by the CBHE as approved public or private institutions may participate in the Access Missouri program.

(B) Public and private institutions are eligible to participate in the Access Missouri program only if they permit faculty members to select textbooks without influence or pressure from any source in order to be approved institutions. This requirement is in addition to requirements set forth in sections 173.1102(2) and (3), RSMo, and elsewhere in this rule. Selection of textbooks within individual departments or schools by faculty curriculum committees shall not be considered inconsistent with this requirement.

(C) To be an approved private institution, an institution must be a nonprofit educational institution operating privately under the control of an independent board and not directly controlled or administered by any public agency or political subdivision. This requirement is in addition to requirements set forth in section 173.1102(2), RSMo, and elsewhere in this rule. For the purposes of this rule, an independent board is one that meets the following minimum criteria:

1. The governing instrument of the institution gives the governing board final decision making authority for the institution;
2. The governing board is composed of a number of members as fixed or provided for in the governing instrument of the institution, who serve for terms of definite duration;
3. Each member of the governing board is free to exercise judgment independently in the interest of the institution without being controlled by any person or authority; and
4. The members of the governing board may not be removed by any authority during their respective terms, except for cause. For purposes of this criterion, "cause" shall not include any reason

based upon religious affiliation, including failure to follow the directives of any purported superior authority, religious or otherwise.

(D) No institution offering a course of study leading only to a degree in theology or divinity shall be eligible for certification as an approved institution under this rule.

(4) The CBHE shall assign institutions to appropriate institutional groups based on length of program, institutional organization, and other criteria it considers applicable to such assignment.

(5) Institutional Responsibilities.

(A) Approved institutions shall--

1. Admit students based on the institution's standard admission policies;

2. Submit a copy of the institution's policy on satisfactory academic progress for the records of the CBHE;

3. Establish fair and equitable refund policies covering tuition, fees, and, where applicable, room and board charges. The refund policy shall be the same policy used by the institution for refunding all federal Title IV financial aid included in the Higher Education Act of 1965;

4. Systematically organize all student records (student financial aid, registrar, business office) pertaining to students who receive Access Missouri awards to be made readily available for review upon request by the CBHE; and

5. Verify each Access Missouri award recipient's eligibility by transmitting the student's record to the CBHE by the annual deadline published by the CBHE for the current academic year.

(B) When the approved institution receives the Access Missouri program funds for the awards made by the CBHE, the approved institution must—

1. Determine if the applicant is enrolled full-time and is making satisfactory progress in his course of study according to standards determined by the approved institution and 6 CSR 10-2.140;

2. Deliver the Access Missouri program funds to the Access Missouri award recipient in the amount determined by the CBHE

using the institution's standard award delivery procedures, retaining the portion of the Access Missouri award that the applicant owes for education-related expenses (tuition, fees, room and board, and/or other education-related expenses) to that institution and promptly give the applicant any remaining funds;

3. Return the applicant's Access Missouri award to the CBHE within thirty (30) days of learning he is no longer eligible to receive an award, if this is determined prior to the delivery of funds to the applicant;

4. Be responsible for the repayment of any funds sent to it by the CBHE within thirty (30) days of learning either of the following:

A. The institution delivered Access Missouri funds to an applicant not eligible under the Access Missouri program if the award was based on erroneous, improper, or misleading information provided by the institution to the CBHE; or

B. The institution delivered the Access Missouri award funds to a person other than the one to whom the CBHE has directed the funds be delivered; and

5. Determine and calculate the amount of refunds to the CBHE based on the institution's refund formula for applicants who withdraw. The funds must be returned to the CBHE within thirty (30) days of the determination a withdrawal has occurred.

(C) The CBHE may refuse to make Access Missouri awards to applicants who attend institutions that fail to make timely refunds to the CBHE as provided above.

(6) Procedures.

(A) All institutions currently holding an approved institution status shall retain said status for a period of three (3) years from the effective date of this rule, unless that status is terminated in accordance with 6 CSR 10-2.140(3) or 6 CSR 10-2.140(6)(C).

(B) Any institution not designated an approved institution on the effective date of this rule shall make application to the CBHE to be certified as an approved institution in order for students attending the institution to be eligible to participate in the Access Missouri program. Applications for approved institution status shall be made on forms provided therefore by the CBHE. Upon certification of an institution as an approved institution by the CBHE, the status of an approved institution shall continue for a

period of three (3) years from the date of certification unless earlier terminated for changes in operation specified in 6 CSR 10-2.140(3) or 6 CSR 10-2.140(6)(C).

(C) During a period in which an institution is certified as an approved institution, if a substantial change occurs in the institution's governing structure; in the institution's hiring policies pertaining to administration, faculty, and staff; in the institution's admissions policies; in the institution's textbook selection procedures; in the level of programs or degrees offered by the institution; in the institution's qualification for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission or other United States Department of Education-recognized accrediting agency; in the institution's record of compliance with lawfully promulgated CBHE policies and procedures; or in any other matter affecting the criteria set forth in sections 173.205(2) or (3), RSMo, the CBHE may consider whether to terminate the institution's approved status because of such change. Institutions shall notify the CBHE in writing within thirty (30) days after any such change occurs. Before the CBHE makes a decision regarding the status of an approved institution, the CBHE may, at its own discretion, hold one (1) or more public hearing(s) under the procedures set forth in subsection (6)(G) of this rule.

(D) If any institution's approved institution status is terminated before the expiration of the three (3) year term, the institution may thereafter apply to the CBHE for recertification on forms provided by the CBHE.

(E) If an approved institution desires to continue its status as an approved institution, it may apply for renewal of its approved institution status by filing an application for recertification as an approved institution at least sixty (60) days before the date its certification would normally expire. An application for recertification as an approved institution shall be made to the CBHE on forms provided by the CBHE.

(F) Upon receipt of a completed institutional application form, the CBHE may certify or recertify the institution as an approved institution or deny certification as an approved institution. The CBHE may base its decision on the information submitted by the institution, on the institution's record of compliance with CBHE policies and procedures, and on any other information that the CBHE deems reliable. The CBHE, at its own discretion, may hold one (1) or more public hearing(s) regarding the merits of the application.

(G) In the event the CBHE requires a hearing, the CBHE shall so advise the institution within a reasonable amount of time. The advice to the institution shall state the time and place of the hearing and the issues of concern to the CBHE. The institution shall publish conspicuous notices of such hearing in its buildings and on its grounds, in areas accessible to staff, faculty, and students, and the notices shall set forth the fact that the hearing is to be held; its date, time, location, and purpose; the telephone number and mailing address of the commissioner of higher education at the department, and advice that comments concerning the issues identified by the CBHE may be communicated to the commissioner of higher education.

(H) The decision to certify, recertify, decertify, or reject initial certification of an institution as an approved institution shall rest solely within the discretion of the CBHE.